DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 069 005 CS 500 042

AUTHOR	Work, William, Ed.
TITLE	Proceedings of the Summer Conference of the Speech Association of America (4th, Chicago, Ill., July 13-14, 1968).
INSTITUTION	Speech Association of America, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	68
NOTE	99p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Speech Communication Association, Statler Hilton Hotel, New York, N. Y. 10001 ($2.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Behavioral Objectives; *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Conference Reports; *Educational Research; Federal Aid; Foundation Programs; Research Methodology; *Research Projects; Rhetorical Criticism; *Student Research

ABSTRACT

The 1968 summer conference of the Speech Association of America (now the Speech Communication Association) was concerned with developments in speech communication research, with primary focus on the recommendations of the February New Orleans conference (ED 028 164), cosponsored by SAA and the U. S. Office of Education. The summer conference opened with a summary of SAA research activities, followed by reports on development in federally sponsored projects and opportunities for use of foundation fund resources. The proceedings include an address on research and the capacity to meet current social changes. There are reports from three SAA groups: the planning committee for the forthcoming National Developmental Project on Rhetoric, the committee on research information retrieval, and the educational policies board. Implications of the New Orleans conference are presented and reviewed from the perspectives of historical, critical, and behavioral scholarship. The proceedings also include reviews of research and instructional development projects in progress, followed by the transcript of a forum discussion on implications of these projects. The document concludes with a bibliography of sources for research materials. (Author/RN)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 069005

PROCEEDINGS

SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA SUMMER CONFERENCE IV

Sheraton-Chicago Hotel, Chicago, Illinois
July 13 and 14, 1968

Edited by
William Work

Speech Association of America
Statler Hilton Hotel
New York, New York 10001

CS 500 042

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Speech Association of America TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

Editor's Note

The Editor expresses his most sincere thanks to all who participated in the conference and to all who helped in the preparation of these Proceedings. He is especially grateful to: the resource personnel, including the members of our own profession who reported at the conference; to SAA President Douglas Ehninger who served as conference moderator; to the members of the Research Board under whose aegis the conference was held; to Robert N. Hall for assisting in the arrangements; and to my secretary, Ursula Arnold, for typing the manuscript.

The transcript which follows has been based primarily on a tape recording that was made of the proceedings. In some instances, speakers have supplied manuscripts. Although the participants have on occastion been quoted directly, the bulk of the transcript represents a paraphrase and distillation of their remarks. Having generally eschewed the use of any quotation marks, the Editor assumes responsibility for the rhetorical style of this report. The resource personnel have, however, been given the opportunity to check the accuracy of the information which has been reported in their respective names.

W.W.

****

Copies of this publication, at $2.00 each prepaid, may be ordered from:

Speech Association of America
Statler Hilton Hotel
New York, N. Y. 10001

Postage and handling charges will be added to orders not prepaid.

Table of Contents

Page

Opening Session (Douglas Ehninger, Marie Nichols, Jack Matthews, James Roever) 1

Remarks of Joseph Murnin 6

Remarks of Robert Poppendieck 11

Remarks of Donald Brieland 20

Luncheon Speaker: John Bystrom, Assistant to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare 27

Reports of SAA Committees

Rhetoric Conference Planning Committee 41
Research Information Retrieval Committee 43
Educational Policies Board 44

SAA-USOE Research and Instructional Development Conference

Background Report 46
Implications for Historical Research 46
Implications for Critical Research 51
Implications for Behavioral/Experimental Research . . . 55

Reports on Small Group Discussions 60

Research and Development Projects in Progress 63

Open Forum 84

Bibliography 90

Key to Sources 93

USOE Regional Offices 94

ERIC Clearing Houses 95

PROGRAM-- 4th ANNUAL SAA SUMMER CONFERENCE

Palmer House, Chicago-- July 13-14, 1968

Presiding: Douglas Ehninger, SAA President

Note: All Sessions in the Monroe Room, 6th Floor, unless otherwise noted.

Saturday, July 13

8:30-9:15 a.m.	Registration (Literature on display)		Monroe Room Foyer
9:15-9:45	Welcome	Douglas Ehninger, President	
	1968 Convention Preview	Marie H. Nichols, 1st Vice-Pres.	
	SAA Research Board	Jack Matthews, Chairman	
	SAA Research Office	James E. Roever, Director of Research-Elect	
9:45-10:30	New Developments in USOE Research Programs	Joseph Murnin, USOE, Chicago	
10:30-10:45	COFFEE BREAK		
10:45-11:30	The Education Professions Development Act	Robert Poppendieck, Field Services Director, USOE Bureau of Educational Personnel Development	
11:30-12:15 p.m.	Using Private Foundation Resources	Donald Brieland, Professor and Associate Dean, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago. (Formerly, Executive Director, Elizabeth McCormick Fund.)	
12:30-2:00	LUNCH		Adams Room
	Speaker	John W. Bystrom, formerly Assistant to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (Educational Television.)	
2:00	Report of Rhetoric Conference Planning Committee	Lloyd Bitzer, Chairman	
	Report of Research Information Retrieval Committee	Larry Barker, Chairman	
	Report of Educational Policies Board	Ronald Reid, Board member	
2:30	SAA-USOE Research and Instructional Development Project		
	Background	William Work, Coordinator	
	Implications of the Project for the Research Scholar:		
	Historical	J. Jeffery Auer	Parlor A
	Critical	Carroll C. Arnold	Parlor B
	Behavioral/Experimental	John Bowers	Parlor C
3:15	Discussion by Panelists	Jack Matthews, Presiding	
3:45	Small Group Discussions	Panelists Presiding	
4:45	Reports of Small Group Discussions		
5:15	NO-HOST COCKTAIL PARTY		(Room to be Announced)

Sunday, July 14

9:00 a.m.	Reports of Research and Instructional Development Projects in Progress	
10:30	Open Forum: Research and Instructional Development in the Communication Arts and Sciences	
10:30	Concurrent Session on Proposal-Writing Robert J. Kibler, Chairman; Dorothy Higginbotham, Alvin Goldberg, W. B. Lashbrook	Parlor C
11:30	Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations for Action	
12:00 noon	ADJOURNMENT	

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Douglas Ehninger, SAA President, Conference Moderator: We welcome you to this fourth annual Summer Conference of the Speech Association of America. It would appear that, as in the past, we are divided between those who have attended previous summer conferences and those who are here for the first time. For me, at least, the support that has been accorded these summer conferences is a significant testament to the continuing concern of our field for research and instructional development. Furthermore, it seems to me, there are one or two distinctive features about the present conference. We will be addressing ourselves to the implications of the SAA-USOE New Orleans conference. This Federally-sponsored meeting brought together some 35 persons from our field-- persons with particular interests in behavioral studies-- deliberated for a week in New Orleans in February on various dimensions of research and instructional development in speech-communication. We will also hear a report from a Committee that is planning another conference on research in the historical-critical area. Our present meeting may also be viewed as a way of welcoming into the official SAA family Dr. James E. Roever who will assume the position of full-time Director of Research for the Association on August 1. I know that Jim will be glad to talk with as many of you as possible during the next day and a half as he approaches his new responsibilities.

Marie H. Nichols, SAA First Vice-President: Despite some elements of chaos-- not unlike those that have characterized this political year-- I can now report to you that the program for the December convention is substantially complete. A total of 119 programs and 9 workshops have been organized. The workshops will take place on the pre-convention day, December 27. There is a great deal of variety both in the regular sessions and in the workshops. I think we can be fairly certain this year that sessions labelled "workshop" will indeed prove to be workshops and not simply additional Interest Group-sponsored substantive programs. As some of you are aware, I have tried to orient the convention around a central theme: Cultural Reorientation. The entire program will not, of course, be oriented in that direction, but enough of it will be that I think that the theme will be evident. We are trying to raise issues and questions of social relevance. The programs will reflect, I believe, our efforts to take greater cognizance of the cultural changes of today. You will, for example, find programs involving such persons as teachers of the underprivileged, persons who themselves represent minority populations, and representatives of the Chicago Police Force. There is one feature of this year's convention program planning that I would like to call to your particular attention. Last year, I volunteered to edit for this year a volume of abstracts of convention papers. This is the first time that SAA has attempted to produce such a publication. We may well run into some problems on this first round, but we plan to have the abstracts of the formal convention papers available by convention time. Because the time for this task is relatively short, and because we do not know fully just what kinds of problems we may have to cope with, I am hereby appealing to all of you to encourage anyone you know who may be preparing a paper for the convention to get the abstract of it to me by the October 1 deadline. With that special appeal, then, and with the assurance that a fully-programed convention will indeed take place in December, I conclude with thanks for your kind attention.

Jack Matthews, SAA Research Board Chairman: It is axiomatic at gatherings such as this that a certain amount of recruiting takes place. I am interested today in a different kind of recruiting. I am interested in recruiting, as it were, ex officio members of the Research Board. In such a capacity, your name will not appear in print, you will not attend any meetings, and your sole responsibility will be the responsibility of the Board itself. In order for you to evaluate this possible assignment, you should know something of the nature and purposes of the Board, something of its past history, and something of its present and proposed future activities. The Board was created in response to a felt concern about the status of research in our field. It seemed clear that informal approaches to this problem were inadequate. The Board was created, therefore, to focus attention on the research dimensions of the profession on a year-round basis. A then revolutionary idea-- that of providing travel support so that the Board could have additional meetings beyond those held at the convention-- was a part of the plan. My own association with the Board over the past two and one half years has provided me with some of my most pleasurable and rewarding experiences in a professional organization context. Part of this satisfaction has derived from the belief that the Board has been able to make a modest contribution, at least, toward improving the amount and quality of research in our field. The Board itself does not engage in research per se. The Board has served as something of an advisory committee to the governing body of the Association. The Board has been asked to give its recommendations relative to the merits of a particular research undertaking. The major contribution of the Board, however, I believe, has been in stimulating others to do a little more thinking and to engage in a little more action in the realm of research. A good part of today's meeting will be devoted to recommendations deriving from the New Orleans Conference, which conference was stimulated by the Research Board of several years ago. The conference brought together--

not for just a few hours, but for a full week-- a group of scholars from our field, most of whom relate particularly to the behavioral sciences. Another example of a past activity of the Board was an interdisciplinary meeting on the language problems of the disadvantaged that was held in New York City last January. Representatives of some 15 national organizations attended. A mimeographed transcript of this meeting is available from the national office. A sub-group of the January conferees will meet in New York in the near future to consider possible next steps. I cite this as an example of the kinds of activities that the Board has generated and can generate in the future. The Board per se does not carry out these projects, but once an area of concern has been identified, the Board attempts to see to it that a mechanism is set up that will result in the project being carried out. Later today, you will hear a report of the Rhetoric Conference Planning Committee, which Committee was created at the instigation of the Board. The proposed conference on rhetoric is viewed as complementary to the New Orleans conference. Lloyd Bitzer was named by the Board to assemble and chair a planning committee for the project. Although I make no claim that the Board has been solely responsible for the retention of a full-time Director of Research-- in the person of Dr. James E. Roever-- it was nonetheless in a meeting of the Board that this idea was suggested,and the Board was asked by the Administrative Council to serve as a search committee for the position. The creation of this position is a further affirmation of the conviction that more staff time needs to be cleared for attention to research problems. A word about future Board activities. At our meeting yesterday, the Board spent a good bit of time discussing possible ways and means for encouraging the implementation of the recommendations of the New Orleans conference. Ultimately, of course, the recommendations will be useless if they don't result in action. Thus, the Board proposes to give this matter high priority. As another example of the way in which the Board functions, we discussed yesterday an area of need which should be explored, the area of the measurement of oral competence. It seems clear that available testing instruments are inadequate,while the need for sophisticated testing procedures continues to grow. The Board does not, of course, propose to develop testing instruments, but it can seek out knowledgeable people from our field to survey the need and make recommendations. Whatever the outcome-- whether a conference or a workshop or some other approach-- it will be the hope of the Board that new and useful activity in this particular problem area will be generated. In the last analysis, the success of the Research Board rests upon our ability to stimulate the imaginations-- to build some bonfires of interest under the members of the Association. Certainly, the Board has no monopoly on research know-how; certainly, it has no monopoly on perceiving what needs to be done in the field. We need you and others in the Association as unofficial ex officio members. We need feedback from you. Please feel free to make your suggestions and identify your needs-- particularly through Jim Roever in the national office. Ultimately, of course, the impact of the Board will be measured by the response to the original charge for which the Board was created-- namely, to do everything possible to increase the quality and the quantity of research in our field.

James E. Roever, SAA Director of Research-Elect: Since accepting the position of Director of Research for SAA last January, numerous questions about the new responsibilities that I will assume on August 1 have arisen. People have asked me what the SAA is, what the SAA Office of Research consists of, and what I will do in connection with it. Because the position is new, it has been a bit difficult to come up with fully cogent answers. The piece that Bill Work wrote in Spectra announcing my appointment to the position has helped to provide me with an answer. He offered the following generalized description: "The responsibilities of the SAA Director of Research will encompass a wide range of activities calculated to improve the climate for and the output of research and development efforts in the communication arts and sciences." Although I do not report for duty officially until August 1, I have already been involved in some SAA activities. It seems clear that, to an extent, at least, the "job description" will evolve as we move ahead with the work at hand. I will nonetheless try this morning to give you a brief sampling of some of the possibilities that I foresee. At the meeting of the Research Board yesterday, I was directed to: 1). Develop ways for implementing the recommendations of the New Orleans conference; 2). Stimulate research proposals and disseminate information about sources of funding; and 3). Develop a proposal for finding funds so that SAA can provide seed grant money for research-oriented conferences. As an example, I will elaborate on just one of these ideas. One of the recommendations that grew out of the New Orleans conference is as follows: "The conferees urge the Speech Association of America to sponsor conferences at regular intervals in response to the needs of its constituent bodies. The concerns of such conferences should include the appraisal and evaluation of current research projects. The findings of such conferences should be internationally disseminated through Association channels." At the instigation of several colleagues, I have spent some time on the development of a preliminary proposal for securing seed grant funds, and I was pleased that the Board approved the undertaking at its meeting yesterday. I believe that we must encourage inter-institutional developmental conferences-- not only as a follow-up on the specific proposals deriving from the New Orleans conference, but also for proposals that come from individuals or groups from within the Association. I envision a plan wherein we would have a printed guideline for a proposal-- similar to guidelines provided by government funding agencies. Persons would send a proposal for a research conference to the Director of Research who would in turn channel it to the members of the Research Board. The Board would then approve, request revision, or reject. Any approved proposal would be granted seed money immediately through the Office of Research. The attempt in such conferences would be to bring together from various parts of the country persons both from our field and from related fields who have interest and expertise in a particular research area. The conferees would seek to establish research needs and priorities and, insofar as possible, make recommendations for specific research projects. A report would be written and disseminated widely through Association channels. At this point, the Office of Research would step out of the picture and institutions and/or individuals would seek support for specific research projects. Given final Research Board approval, I hope to find an agency that will provide us with a relatively unencumbered lump sum of money from which seed grants can be made. I cite this, then, as only one example of the kinds of services that the Office of Research can provide. I hope to establish an information clearing house on all approaches made in the name of SAA to government or private funding agencies. I am working with the Rhetoric Conference Planning Committee, and I will be responsible, under the direction of the Board, for structuring future SAA summer conferences. I should perhaps mention that during the last four years at Northwestern University my own teaching and research activities have had a bias in the direction of behavioral and experimental studies. Although my training at the University of Iowa was directed toward speech-communication research and social psychology, I can assure you that my background has not been in these areas alone. My training also included exposure to the teaching of such persons as A. Craig Baird, Oscar Brockett, and Donald Bryant. I intend to work with persons who are interested in research in all phases of the communication arts and sciences, despite my own particular orientation. I find the prospect of moving away from narrow specialization not at all unpleasant. If I am to adequately represent you in this position, I will, as Jack Matthews has pointed out, need your cooperation. Toward that end, I would like to make several specific requests at this time. I hope that you will write to me and let me know what services you think the Office of Research should provide. I hope that those of you who have regular research reports that you send out will put me on your mailing list so that I may keep abreast of the kinds of research that are being carried out. I hope that you will let me know about special research conferences-- at your own institution or elsewhere-- at which you feel that SAA should be represented. I will also welcome and will review with the Board any suggestions that you may have for next year's summer conference. Just as I invite your suggestions about things that we should do, so I will value your reactions after projects have been completed. Next year, I feel safe in promising you, we will have more complete answers to the questions of what the Office of Research is and what the Director of Research does. Thank you.

Remarks of Dr. Joseph Murnin, Director of Educational Resear U. S. Office of Education, Region V:

-- As in the past, it is a pleasure to meet with you at this annual SAA summer conference. Some of you will recall my earlier discussion with you of the research decentralization plans of the U. S. Office of Education. I mentioned then that the Chicago Regional Office was the prototype for the country in this decentralization plan. The next summer, I came back and described some of the developments that had taken place during that first year. I also called attention to a second reorganization of the Bureau of Research that had taken place. When Bill Work asked me to join you again this summer, I asked myself what new useful information I could bring to you.

-- You will recall that one of the underlying reasons for the decentralization of the U. S. Office of Education was to provide better service at the regional level to the educational community. In the years before coming to Chicago that I served in the USOE in Washington, I could count on the fingers of one hand the visits that I had made to smaller institutions. I was well acquainted with the larger universities from coast to coast, and had visited on many of their campuses. Since I have been in the Regional Office, however, I have been in contact in one way or another with representatives of a large majority of the institutions located in Region V-- and there are some 473 of them.

-- It may be useful if I report on the activities of the program during the fiscal year of 1968 which ended on June 30. As I draw from my experience in the Chicago office, you will be able to generalize therefrom for the other regional offices. All 9 of these offices are now staffed with a Director of Educational Research.

-- As many of you are aware, fiscal 1968 was not what we would call a good year for the USOE Bureau of Research. We started out on what we thought was going to be a pretty good year and then, in the middle of September, a freezing of funds was imposed on the program. This meant in essence that any proposals received in the regional offices could not be reviewed; they could not be reviewed because under the Cooperative Research Act, as amended in Title IV of P.L. 89-10, there is a specific provision that all proposals must have been reviewed and recommendations made by non-government personnel. Since our readers are under contract, and since the freeze on funds did not permit us to meet the provisions of the contract, we were unable to send out proposals for review and recommendations. Travel and other aspects of administrative support were also curtailed. The freeze remained on until the middle of December. This meant, as you can well imagine, that we accumulated a large backlog of proposals with which we could do nothing. This quite obviously had a very upsetting effect on the time schedules that had been set forth by the proposal initiators.

-- We experienced another problem this last year. Some of you will recall that one of the conditions under which the regional offices were established was that the offices would be able to bring in panels of reviewers who could arrive at consensus recommendations through face-to-face deliberation. To me, at least, this was a very important feature of our regional operations. It was not only important to me as the Director, but it was important to you in the field. After the 1965 USOE reorganization, the policy of having general reader panels was discontinued. The policy was to send proposals out to readers-- along with a standardized set of criteria-- with the request that each of the 5 readers return his evaluation. It was then the task of the research coordinator to spread out the 5 recommendations and attempt to achieve a consensus. The advantage of the panel system is that, in the first place, the readers really do their homework. In the second place, when you bring evaluators face-to-face, and you consider each proposal on the basis of its strengths and weaknesses, you do develop a great deal of useful interaction. The end result is a much stronger kind of consensus.

-- During fiscal 1968, therefore, we had to resort to the Washington method of sending proposals out to reviewers with the request that they be returned to me for a final decision. Even though we did have our problems, I was able to award 65 small research projects. After realizing what we might expect in fiscal 1968, I did attempt to apprise potential proposal initiators of the difficulties that we faced. This notwithstanding, we received 176 proposals. Our first year here in the regional office, we received 226 proposals. Although we had closed the door somewhat, clearly we had not closed it tightly. This same general pattern was observed in the other regional offices. It indicates to me that, if we were in a better fiscal situation, the small research program would grow by leaps and bounds.

-- Let us turn now to what we can expect in the fiscal year of 1969 which began on July 1. I should preface this by saying that a certain amount of conjecture is involved. The allotment for the program this year will be sent to the regional offices and awards will be made from the regional offices. We have contracting officers now in all of the regional offices so that the small research program will be completely decentralized. We are going to reactivate the reader panels, and we will bring the panels into the office for group deliberation. We will continue this procedure at least until such time as we are told to discontinue it.

-- A few remarks about the direction that the Bureau of Research is taking with reference to solicited and unsolicited proposals may be in order. The regional research program is the only truly unsolicited program administered under Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Washington office is moving more and more toward developmental projects. About a year ago, some of you will recall, Dr. Bright proposed this new direction for the Bureau of Research. In essence, this new direction is to encourage longitudinal, in-depth, long-range research efforts. It involves developing an idea and carrying the idea forward into an operational situation.- into the classroom. Research is viewed as an important part of the total effort, but it takes its place at various points in a total operational plan toward the end that appropriate validity and reliability will be achieved.

-- One idea that is being discussed is to place a research team at the disposal of the regional offices. This team would consist of 4 individuals who would be trained under contract by the Oregon System of Higher Education. The team members would be equipped to conduct institutes, workshops, et al. and to work with persons interested in writing proposals for research support. As presently envisioned, the team members would not be under contract to the USOE, but rather they would be under contract to the Oregon System. Their salaries and any resettlement costs would be paid under the terms of the contract, as would their per diem and travel. The idea here is that, if your institution were interested in receiving any of the kinds of services that the team members were equipped to supply, you would contact the regional office Director who could, at his discretion, fill your request. From time to time, members of the research team would return to Oregon in order, so to speak, to be refurbished. The back-up resource materials similarly would be updated from time to time on the basis of experience.

-- In the event that your own institution does not have the complete resources of the USOE ERIC system, these resources will be available in each of the regional offices. Eventually, we hope to have a research librarian and be in a position to undertake certain kinds of search activities for you.

-- A very important step forward in the regional research program is that we have opened ourselves up, so to speak, to evaluation. Columbia University has been awarded a contract to make a study of the regional research program in all 9 of the regional offices and come up with recommendations relating to administration and policy.

-- This concludes my formal remarks; I will be glad to answer questions now or later in the day. Thank you.

Questions for Dr. Murnin

Q: Could you say a little more about these regional office research teams that have been proposed?

A: If I didn't make it clear, I should make it clear that this is in the offing. We do not at the present time have a contract for these services. This program may be initiated during the present fiscal year or it may not come about until a subsequent fiscal year-- depending on a number of intervening variables. The purpose of the teams would be to provide a kind of expertise to institutions and individual researchers that we presently do not have the personnel capability of providing.

Q: Would these team members be on a full or on a part-time basis?

A: They would be on a full-time basis.

Q: Can you give us any idea how many proposals in the general area of speech-communication have been submitted during this last year?

A: I am sorry, I do not have that information with me. We do review a large number of proposals in the communication area, and we have supported a number of them.

Q: Could you mention one or two specific proposals of the kind that you have received-- or of the kind that you would like to receive?

A: We have no priorities in our program. This is why I stressed that it is truly an unsolicited program. The program is aimed to serve the efforts of individual researchers-- the person with an idea who wants to work on that idea. A proposal can, of course, be interdisciplinary; there is no question about that. As I like to express it, we can support anything that has to do with the end-product of an institution of learning-- and that is a graduating student. This includes learner processes, learner characteristics, teacher training, student-faculty relationships, faculty and student relationships with the administration, or even the institution in the community. The parameters of acceptability are very broad. We do apply a criterion that aims to avoid redundancy. Studies in areas that have been quite thoroughly researched are not likely to receive support. Although I do not mean to suggest that these are closed areas, two areas that have been heavily researched are, to cite some examples, instructional television and remedial reading.

Q: Can you tell us a little more about the reader panels?

A: In Region V, we attempt to have on our panels a representation of the total educational community that we serve. We have readers from small institutions, from large institutions, and even from school districts, although the latter are difficult to find. We have invited the chief state education officers to submit the names of their directors of research as panelists; several of them have done so. Each of our panels is made up of 5 persons. We try to make certain that generalists are represented. We would be more likely to have a person from curriculum research than a person with a narrow, disciplinary identification.

Q: Do you have the same set of readers for all proposals, or do you select the readers after you receive the proposals?

A: We wait until we have 15 proposals. Then I convene a panel. I send the 15 proposals out to the readers and give them 3 weeks in which to study them. If I receive up to 5 additional proposals during the first week after sending out the original 15, I send them along as well. This, then, would give the panel a maximum of 20 proposals to consider.

Q: Does this panel, then, handle proposals from, for example, chemistry and English and history?

A: Yes. This is true except for proposals in the arts and humanities. For such proposals we resort to the non-panel, at-home review by selected individuals. We have a special roster of readers in the arts and humanities.

Q: What was the average size of the grants that were awarded this last year?

A: You know, of course, that the small research program has a ceiling of $10,000-- including indirect costs. We also have an 18-month time limit in which to complete the project. The average figure is around $8500. They range from three or four thousand dollars to $9999.

Remarks of Dr. Robert Poppendieck, Field Services Director, USOE Bureau of Educational Personnel Development.

-- Let me state at the outset, since the focus of this conference appears to be on research, that the Education Professions Development Act is only on the periphery of research. I will try to make some appropriate cross references between the EPDA and research. I would like to give you a quick overview of what is in the EPDA, review its background, to clarify where we stand now, and suggest something about our concerns and potential.

-- EPDA was passed by Congress a year ago and signed by the President on June 29, 1967. It started out to be an amendment to the Higher Education Act of 1965. As such, three of the five parts of the Act are amendments to and enrichments of the Higher Education Act of 1965. This Act dealt with extension services, with aid to developing institutions, with student scholarship funds, and, in Title V, it dealt with teacher education. Under the guise of teacher education, it invented the Teacher Corps and it invented fellowships for teachers. These fellowships included pre-service fellowships, handled by the Bureau of Higher Education, and Experienced Teacher Fellowships, handled by the same unit that was handling Institutes. The big question a year ago was whether the Teacher Corps was going to continue at all. Friends in Congress assured us that it would get through, and it did. The thing that was not fully anticipated was that the enactment that continued the authority for the Teacher Corps for another three years also introduced several new pieces of legislation. EPDA, therefore, emerges as a multi-faceted piece of legislation which started out as a amendment to some relatively smaller concerns for teacher education and ended up as being the freest piece of education legislation that has ever come from the Hill and by far the most comprehensive for teacher education.

-- I will now describe briefly the various parts of the Education Professions Development Act. Part A is merely enabling. It establishes a very important Advisory Council. While this Council gets its funds from the Office of Education, it operates independently of the Office of Education and is not to be, so to speak, "contaminated" by USOE personnel. If you have concerns about the direction in which EPDA should move, recommended modifications in administrative procedures, and you feel hesitant about communicating these views to the Office, you should not hesitate to communicate with the Council Chairman, Dr. Laurence Haskew at the University of Texas-- or with any members of the Council. They will welcome your expressions of concern. The Council will be holding two hearings shortly--

one in the Atlanta area, and one in the New York City area-- to learn what people are thinking about the EPDA operations. Incidentally, the Haskew Council has authority to ride herd not only on EPDA, not only on all programs in the Office of Education that have bearing on the education of educators, but on all programs in the Federal government that have a bearing on the education of educators. This includes the National Science Foundation, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and on down the list through a total of some 84 programs in some 23 different Federal agencies. The USOE is one of these agencies and it operates 16 of the programs. Part A also includes a small unit to make a study of the status of the education of educators in our country. It provides a little bit of money for recruiting and attracting people to education, but the House has taken this out and I doubt that it will get back in this year. It provides for a transfer of funds from one agency to another, and it provides for consultant service and assessment.

-- Part B is a money program that splits into two pieces, one of which is the Teacher Corps. The Teacher Corps is a work-study-type program making committed teachers of the disadvantaged out of liberal arts graduates. There are some variations on this, but that is its major focus. It is a two-year, learn-to-do-it-by-doing-it program in the ghetto areas. We frequently speak of it as a time-and-a-half program -- half-time in the college, half-time in the school, and half-time in the community. Unless Teacher Corps functions in this manner, it cannot achieve an impact with the disadvantaged youth in his culture and community. Relatively few of the Teacher Corps projects are dealing uniquely with speech, although some of them do have an overlap with speech problems.

-- The second section of Part B was put in for the same reason as Teacher Corps to attract new people to teaching as a profession. B-2 is identified as "attracting and qualifying people to meet critical teacher shortage." It is identified as a State plan-type program. Congress likes State plans. There is a specific relationship between the constituency of a Congressman and the way the money is being allocated. The State plan part, B-2, is new. It asks this year for $15 million to be funded on a pupil enrollment ratio basis to the States. The allocation is in proportion to the number of elementary and secondary school pupils-- public and private-- enrolled in the State. The State plan program involves money through the State to the local districts, with the State retaining only 3% for administration. Most of the money goes to the local district to attract and prepare for teaching persons who come largely from the local district and who have not previously been associated with teaching -- at least not recently.

Colleges will be involved to a certain extent in the State plan programs, but only by subcontracting. The great problem here for EPDA is that there will not be nearly enough money. The State bears not only the administrative responsibility but must also make judgments relative to priorities. It must determine how it will allocate its funds to the areas of most critical shortage. I doubt that many States will identify as a critical area a shortage of teachers of speech. I think they are more apt to say that you have a critical shortage when you have a class of 36 pupils and no teacher of any kind. Most of the funds, I believe, will go to straight classroom teaching. The librarians and counsellors tell us that there are critical shortages in their realms in the disadvantaged communities. Perhaps you in speech education could make a case for more personnel who could get right down at the level of the youngsters who are having difficulty in learning because of their difficulties with oral language.

-- Earlier this week, I played "hookey" for a few hours from the office to go over to the District of Columbia Teacher's College to look in on a summer institute for teachers of the disadvantaged. This is the fourth such institute that they have conducted there. It happened that the particular problem that they were working on in 3 different sections which I visited was a problem of getting the youngsters to talk -- getting the youngsters to give more than one-word answers to questions-- getting youngsters to speak up in terms of their interests. They were working around a theme of pets. One teacher was asking the children what kinds of pets they had or what kinds of pets they would like to have. She also recognized that some of the youngsters probably had no interest at all in having a pet. A whole host of developmental materials were available-- pictures of animals, toy animals, and a procedure for having youngsters give brief descriptions and act out the way pets behave, followed by having the other youngsters guess which pet was involved. They were also concerning themselves with the sounds that pets make. Meanwhile, another teacher, an assistant, was at the blackboard listening and recording the words that were used. The whole thrust was to get one-word youngsters to engage in connected discourse. I probably do not need to tell you that speech is an important concern for the general classroom teacher. It may be through this approach that the critical nature of speech teaching in the State plans can be established.

-- Part C of EPDA is a continuation of Part C of Title V of the 1965 legislation, fellowships for teachers. It has been expanded to include fellowships for teachers of pre-school youngsters, fellowships for teachers in adult education, and for post-secondary vocational teachers. Other than these, the categories are generally the same. The price tag on this section last year was $35 million; the appropriations request price tag was $43.5 million. The House approved this latter figure on June 26, despite the fact that the Subcommittee on appropriations only recommended the same $35 million as last year. The higher appropriations appeared to be a result, in part at least, of the higher appropriations that had been made immediately prior for impacted districts. I am optimistic over the prospects of the Senate sustaining the House level of appropriations.

- The matter of when the appropriations come through is of some moment to us. If Congress recesses the first week in August to attend the conventions, it is doubtful whether appropriations will have been handled prior to that time. This would mean a delay until Congress re-assembles around the first week of September. If they stay in session, there will be pressure to take care of appropriations matters during the second week of August. If there is a second recess for the election, then we may not get appropriations action until November.
- Part D is new; it did not exist in last year's Higher Education Act. It is something of a sequel to Title XI of the National Defense Education Act. The NDEA legislation came into being about ten years ago, and it started out with institutes in guidance and counselling, and institutes for teachers of modern foreign languages. After about three years, the USOE secured a legal interpretation that English, when taught as a second language, could be treated as a modern foreign language and institutes could be provided in this area. It wasn't until 1964 that there was a real breakthrough and some 7 areas were identified as acceptable categories for institutes. These new categories included English, reading, media specialists, and teachers of the disadvantaged.
- I know that you people are concerned about possible ambiguities between your field and the field of English. In the NDEA institute program, however, it was the fact that English was included that made it possible for institutes in speech to be funded. It would have been difficult to get a separate Congressional enactment recognizing speech as a separate category.
- There is a sidelight on this category matterthat may be of interest to you. When the 7 new categories were being conconsidered several years ago, "remedial reading" not "reading" was being recommended. It was Senator Wayne Morse, who, at the very last minute, successfully moved to have the word "remedial" stricken.
- Through the Higher Education Act of 1965, civics, economics, and industrial arts were added. At about the same time, the arts and humanities legislation made provision for institutes in those areas. A program, then, that grew from 2 areas grew

to include 15 areas, and has now been even further expanded by EPDA. The institutes running this summer are a continuation of the NDEA program. We have proposals in the office for next year under EPDA. Congress has allowed the authority for NDEA Title XI institutes to expire. The NDEA authority expires on June 30, and the new EPDA authority went into effect on July 1. The new authority is non-categorical. It can reach from nursery school through graduate levels of college.

-- Parts C and D provide institutes for school personnel; Part E makes provision for institutes for college personnel. Part E is administered by a separate unit in the office. Peter Muirhead and the Bureau of Higher Education prefer that the administration of institutes and fellowships for higher education personnel be handled in that Bureau. This does make good sense.

-- The several dimensions of the EPDA legislation, then, are as follows: Fellowship and institute authority for college-level personnel through Part E, administered by the Bureau of Higher Education; fellowships and institutes for school-level personnel, administered by the new Bureau of Educational Personnel Development; State plan money to attract and qualify new people for teaching, to be funneled by the new Bureau through State Departments of Education to local districts and only subcontracted by them to colleges; and B-1, the Teacher Corps. When Congress established EPDA, it did not tamper with the undergraduate, four-year program that produces some 200,000 teachers each year. Congress apparently assumed that this pipeline would continue to flow. It provided EPDA with the State plan and with Teacher Corps to get more people in addition to that pipeline. The institute and fellowship programs are designed to improve the products of the pipeline. We have no authority to work with the undergraduate four-year program. One of our dreams is to get legislative authority to allow us to improve the manner in which teachers are prepared in the first place. One way in which the four-year program in an institution can be used is if that institution has a program for attracting persons from the ghetto who otherwise would never have had a chance to go to college and hence would have had no opportunity to prepare for teaching. Thus, the four-year program can be utilized, but only if it is reaching a new population.

-- Another limitation lies in the fact that this is not legislation dealing in bricks and mortar. This is not legislation dealing with books and other library resources, lesson plans, or curriculum development. This legislation focuses on personnel-- from pre-school through post-doctoral. It doesn't deal with research; research is handled by an entirely separate Bureau.

-- There is in the legislation a reaching out for coordination. The new Bureau has responsibility for coordinating within the office and within government all programs bearing on the education of educators. Just as the Haskew Committee has the responsibility from the outside, so we have the responsibility from the inside. If, for example, there is inadequate cooperation between Joe Murnin and me, it is my fault. If there is inadequate coordination between EPDA and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, it is our fault. We have a little money for consultants, both to ride herd on us and to assist you. The possibilities of getting intra-office coordination and cooperation in the field-- through consortia, for example-- suggest that it may become possible for an agency or a group of agencies to submit a unified proposal and draw support from several sources of Federal funds.

-- Yesterday, I spent some time talking with the representatives of a local institution who would like to submit a proposal that essentially involves research but in which they want to include more training of people at the beginning teaching level than could normally be supported under a purely research program. They want to improve the competence of the supervisors of beginning teachers in the ghetto areas; this is a dimension that could hardly be supported as research, so it becomes our responsibility. This kind of cooperative effort is new for us; the guidelines don't tell how to accomplish it. If you want to attempt such a proposal, include a footnote calling our attention to the fact that the guidelines do not make adequate provision for the inter-agency cooperation that you are seeking. Ask us to put our heads together in the Office and come up with a composite funding solution. The solution may involve separate line items in the budget.

-- There is some possibility that we may set up the equivalent of a "dial-a-prayer" operation. We're going to see if it may not prove feasible to make available a 2½-3-minute recording each week reporting the very latest developments in our office.

-- We are concerned about developing and maintaining effective working relationships with associations. A professional organization is not an eligible applicant to EPDA. But an association can be standing behind an institution or other agency that is seeking support. There is no reason, for example, why a committee within your organization should not be formed to draft a position paper relative to research on improving the competencies of, for example, teachers of ghetto children at the second grade level. Or, such a committee might address itself to improving the competencies of teachers toward the end that secondary school children in general receive more effective instruction in communication through speech. The focus could even be on improving the competencies of college professors of speech. Such a project could pertain to any educational level. It might be an intensive post-doctoral seminar. It probably ought to have some new dimensions in terms of really coming to grips with real problems. It probably ought not to be a simple, immersion seminar of six weeks' duration wherein participants frequently go home and are very little changed by what they have been through. An immersion experience followed by on-the-job assignments, with adequate supervision, and with adequate opportunity for conferring with one's fellows, may yield more useful results. We don't know what the answers are, but we feel that newer approaches are needed. We are prodding for more effective answers from the field.

-- Whether you are interested in proposals relating to the research dimensions of teacher education, or whether you are interested in proposals for actual teacher education projects, let me offer a few suggestions. First, you should constantly remind yourself when writing a proposal that there needs to be a purpose, an intent, and that it should be abundantly clear. Unless your proposal is clear about what it is trying to do, don't bother to send it in. Second, don't hesitate to give yourself credit for your past accomplishments, but at the same time, give recognition to answers to the question of why you should be submitting this particular proposal. A third thing that you should ask yourself is what it is that you need in order to accomplish your purposes. This is where Federal participation comes in. It is intended to help you capitalize your resources in order to achieve your purposes. A fourth point is, don't try to go it alone. Your proposal should be the result of group effort. Be sure that your associates-- both in your own institution and in related agencies-- are involved in the thinking and planning as well as in the implementation of your project. Improvement involves cooperative effort. EPDA is essentially a cooperative venture.

Questions for Dr. Poppendieck

Q: How is the specialist that is involved different from the general classroom teacher?

A: As in the preceding authority for the NDEA Title XI, the focus in EPDA in specialized areas is on the specialist himself. It is seen as increasing his competence-- first, in his specialty, and second, in his work with the regular classroom teacher. EPDA can advance the competence of speech specialists, both in speech and in helping teachers to work with speech problems. This approach affects the greatest number. For instance, in the realm of newer media, the institutes have focused on developing the specialist rather than on assisting the general classroom teacher to improve his competency in media-- although that is one part of it. There is one idea that came from the media area that we like to see applied in other areas. We like to see institutes which have as the unit of instruction a team such as a supervisor or principal and 3 of his teachers, one of whom might be a specialist. The involvement of such a team is likely to make more of a difference when the participants return to their home school districts. The single teacher may have some difficulty in making an impact on the home front.

Q: Has the Office determined that such projects as the Triple-T project-- such as the one at Nebraska-- proved sufficiently effective that the Office would welcome additional proposals of that kind?

A: I think we like Triple-T. Triple-T is encompassed within the C-D portions of the enactment. Some of the C-D funds will be used to continue Triple-T programs, and I think that there may very well be more like them. We don't have enough money to sprinkle it here and there in little bits. The chances are that the Federal investment pays off better when there is a relatively sizable impact, with a sizable program and a solid demonstration component at one or two places.

Q: You have talked about more and better teachers. In specific relation to teachers of the disadvantaged, I would like to know what kinds of proposals-- what the content has been-- in proposals designed to improve the competencies of such teachers. I am particularly concerned about what you meant by "better" teachers.

A: One of the crucial elements in programs for teachers of the disadvantaged has been in effecting the social attitudes and empathies of the teachers. This is not something that is accomplished by college classroom lectures. It's something that you do by involving the participant in real relationships with people. In the institute that I was visiting this week, they start with their large-class session in the morning, then they break into 3 segments, and then they become involved in the individual tutoring of youngsters. As a matter of fact, it has become something of a pattern in institutes for teachers of the disadvantaged for each participant to become the mentor, the "sponsor," of one or two of the neighborhood youngsters. This involves not only close personal relationships in the institute setting itself, but it also takes the participants out into the community. It is not unusual for the youngster to invite the adult to his home. This has led to considerable progress in "acceptance." Actual involvement with people in the ghetto changes one's insights, one's empathies, one's attitudes. It challenges some of them to think seriously about their fitness, and their willingness to continue in that kind of work. This has been one of the experiences in the Teacher Corps. Teacher Corps has been insisting upon a tripod program that involves one third of the activity in the community. It has resulted in presenting a challenge to other teachers who have not involved themselves in the community. As far as straight method is concerned, I do not think there is a great deal of difference. We doknow that there is much more one-to-one teaching in the teaching of the disadvantaged. We've paid lip service for years to the merits of individualized instruction. The individualization in the Teacher Corps program may well mean that we are creating a generation of teachers who really understand these one-to-one relationships. Concern for people and individualized effort-- these are about the only things that are really new in method.

"Using Private Foundation Resources," Donald Brieland, The School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago: A president of an outstanding liberal arts college was recognized as an excellent fund raiser. One day someone reporte that he must be sick because they had seen him walking down the campus with his hands in his own pockets. Fund raising has always been an important task for college administrators but with the development of special projects by academic departments, both the department chairman and his colleagues get into the business, too.

We all have our preferred sources of grants. As a psychologist, I would look first to the National Institutes of Health or the U. S. Children's Bureau. From your reports, for the field of speech the U. S. Office of Education would be regarded as the most likely source of support. Government agencies have been responsible for large grant funds and sometimes have even solicited universities for worthwhile projects involving research, training, and the provision of educational equipment.

In the Proceedings of the 1967 Summer Conference of the Speech Association of America, only one project was included supported by a private foundation-- the Danforth Foundation of St. Louis, Missouri. It made a grant to a developmental conference on speech communication and the American Indian High School student.

Why consider private foundations? Several major reasons make it worthwhile-- in fact profitable-- to have a full understanding of private foundation resources.

-- Funds are needed for pilot projects that can later lead to government support.
-- Government financing is not available for some areas of activities.
-- Government funds are inadequate to finance all the important activities.
-- Government funds are often tenuous and may be withdrawn.

The private foundation field is much more complex, but provides an important resource that is often neglected by university faculty who need support for projects. My purpose today is to present a general summary of guidelines in dealing with the private foundations and to make some personal observations as the result of 15 years of service as a private foundation executive, a researcher, and as a consultant to others seeking grants.

We can begin with a commonly accepted definition of foundation. A foundation is a non-governmental, non-profit organization having principal funds of its own, managed by its own trustees or directors, and established to maintain or aid social, educational, charitable, religious or other activities serving the common welfare.

An initial problem is the difficulty in identifying a foundation. Foundations do not always use the word in their name-- trust or fund are also common nouns. And some so-called foundations are not really foundations at all. The most obvious example is the National Foundation-- a fund raising organization that seeks money from the general public to carry on education and research on several disease entities.

Potential grantees soon become familiar with the Foundation Directory published by the Russell Sage Foundation which has for many years been interested in the charitable foundation and in the care and feeding of philanthropoids. In the third edition of the Directory published in 1967, 6,803 corporations and trusts are described. Each possesses assets of over $200,000 or distributes $10,000 or more annually. In the last 3 years, there was a net gain of nearly 1,500 foundations. There are, in addition, over 10,000 very small foundations. Their total assets are only $387,000 whereas assets of the 6,800 larger foundations total $20 billion.

There are 3 general types of foundations-- all potential sources of funds for those attending this meeting-- 1) company sponsored foundations; 2) community foundations; 3) family or individual foundations. Company sponsored foundations are often but not always mainly interested in supporting activities related to the business or to the geographic area in which business activities are located. Community foundations are a collection of funds and bequests administered in terms of the wishes of the donors and many have a wide variety of activities including provision of scholarships and funds for research. Family foundations carry out the wishes of the donors-- living or deceased. The smaller ones merely provide a mechanism for more flexible use of charitable contributions that a person would otherwise give as an individual.

Grants in 1966 by field accounted for the following percentages of total grants made:

FIELD	PER CENT
Education	24
International Activities	21
Humanities	18
Welfare	12
Science	11
Health	9
Religion	5

Religion is a special interest of the very small foundations not included in the list above. One-third of the very small group have an interest in that field.

In seeking funds, the Foundation Directory would be most useful if you could turn to the term "Speech" and find listed there all of the major potential sources of private support. Unfortunately, it is not that simple. If the interest is drama or interpretation, there is a category called Performing Arts with 4 listings; for speech correction the following listings may be relevant: handicapped (7), health (15), and rehabilitation (3). For rhetoric and public address there are 7 classified under history, 4 under political science, and 3 under language and literature. Similar listings could be developed for voice science, teaching of speech, and other sub-specialties.

With private foundations, it is often said that it is more a matter of whom you know rather than the merits of the projects. Within limits with small foundations,this may be true. Yet some require all requests to come in letter form and do not hold discussions with applicants. If the foundation has one or more professional staff members, the contacts will be made with staff. Then application forms or a standard application proeedure are much more likely. To justify having a staff and to take the heat off the board, all contacts on behalf of a project may be required to be made with the staff member rather than with individual directors.

The best method is generally to make a preliminary inquiry by phone or letter to determine the appropriateness of a proposal and whether there are any funds available. Then the application can be developed to meet the requirements of the specific foundation. It saves time to clear first.

We might review in some detail the 5 foundations under the index heading of "communication." They are:

-- The Disney Foundation, Burbank, California, with assets of $1.2 million and grants of $317,836. Research in audio-visual education; education scholarships in any art or science.
-- Alfred I. DuPont Radio Awards Foundation, Jacksonville, Florida. Awards for meritorious service in radio and television; scholarships in communications. Assets, $288,067; grants, $7,500.
-- Smart Family Foundation, Chicago, Illinois. Production and purchase of educational films at less than cost; also established a tissue and organ bank at a local hospital. Assets, $480,000; grants, $42,102.

-- Ford Foundation-- included because in their statement is a reference to non-commercial television. Assets, $3 billion; expenditure, $345 million for grants and projects.
-- Payne Foundation, Cleveland, Ohio. Assets, $167,000; grants, $125,000. Welfare of mankind, primarily youth emphasis; the media of mass communication and education.

From these 5 examples, we see the wide range of resources and grants given. The DuPont name might suggest a major resource but its track record does not. The Smart Family Foundation has taken on a local cause quite outside its field. The Ford Foundation has a special interest in one specialized area of communications. The Payne Fund spends almost as much per annum as its total assets and receives about that amount in new gifts each year. None of these foundationsis an ideal resource for most areas that comprise the speech field.

The Danforth Foundation description is: Strengthen essential quality of education; special emphasis, liberal education and preparation of college teachers. Assets, $145 million; grants and programs, $5.1 million.

The ideal project for a private foundation. The typical requirements of a private foundation can be illustrated in terms of a project that is most likely to be funded. The project will:
-- 1. Involve the expressed area of interest of the foundation. This is less important with small family foundations. Some of them are very flexible.
-- 2. Entail a modest amount of money. An annual grant of $25,000 or more to a single project is considered rather large by the typical private foundation. $5,000 to $10,000 is more within a range that can be manageable and still lead to a significant outcome. For initial development of a pilot project, grants from $1,000 to $2,500 are most often considered.
-- 3. Include the likelihood of larger grant support from someone else later. Many foundations like to see their grants used as seed money. They will often finance desirable pilot projects for this reason.
-- 4. Have a definite time period-- most foundations like to use their resources for innovation. This is impossible if they marry a limited number of long-term projects. This does not mean that renewals cannot be sought but generally a 3-5 year commitment is the outside limit.
-- 5. Originate from the geographic area where the foundation is located. This requirement is essential if the foundation has geographical limits. Without such limits, a home area project still often receives preferential treatment. Even if a local foundation has not made grants to a given field,

the fact of being local may be an overriding consideration. Moral: start at home if possible.

-- 6. Originate from or involve the endorsement of a person who is recognized for his competence. Foundations, like governmental agencies, are conservative and do not like to bet on unknown people, even though this may seem unfair. A poor project with a "name" investigator may fare better than an excellent one from a person who is not well known. Auspices also help. The University of Chicago means more than West Overshoe Wyoming State Teachers College.

-- 7. Be submitted during the early part of the fiscal year. Although applicants may not know the fiscal year without asking, many foundations allocate most of the available funds early in the year. A proposal may be rejected apparently on its merits, that would have been approved earlier in the year.

-- 8. Involve the possibility of sharing costs with other foundations. Foundations in the same field occasionally share the support of larger projects. If one is sold on a project, it may help with others.

My experience with private foundation funds has been that they are somewhat easier to obtain for small projects; that one grant may lead to others because private foundations like to support people that they know; and that they permit a wider range of activities than do federal agencies. The amount of resources available suggest an almost untapped source of support for the field of speech.

Questions for Dr. Brieland

Q: If a project is already underway and has been funded by private industry, what would be the reaction of private foundations to an approach for additional or continuing support?

A: This will depend very much on the specific project and on the specific foundation. Ideally, foundations regard their resources as venture capital. They would rather support something new. From that standpoint, then, it would be difficult to go from on-going industrial support to foundation support. However, a project may be going from phase 1 to phase 2, introducing thereby an element of newness, or it may be a matter of very high priority--something in the civil rights or race relations area--in either of which cases foundation support might be granted. The usual posture of foundations is to want to be in on something new, be in on the germinal activity, and then to pass it on to somebody else, rather than to receive it from somebody else. I think that the deadest kind of project for the foundations is the project that has been reviewed by a federal agency, has been turned down, and then has been handed on to the foundation substantially unchanged. From the foundation viewpoint, this has about as much appeal as last Tuesday's mashed potatoes. Even though the reasons that the federal agency has turned it down may be valid, and may have nothing to do with the merits of the project-- that is, it may truly have been turned down because of a lack of funds-- it is better to go to the private source first or to rewrite it so that it's a somewhat different project and thereby has the curse of death removed from it. There are all sorts of hazards here, and any generalization that can be made in this regard can be matched by an exception. The emphasis is certainly on novelty and on high-priority issues. We are doing a project now in a ghetto area on the expressed attitudes of people seeking helping services-- in terms of the race of the helping person. We can get all kinds of money to do this. We can get $10,000 or we can get $100,000 because all that we have on this is a lot of hearsay from Black Power advocates on one side and from the white social worker on the other. Even with the validity problem that is obvious in this kind of research, first-hand evidence is better than what we now have. I could suggest similar studies involving white populations that you couldn't sell if you tried for 5 years.

Q: Is it possible to make any generalizations about foundations with respect to indirect costs?

A: It is highly variable. The larger the foundation, the more likely it is to pay indirect costs. Many universities, for example, will not accept grants unless provision for indirect costs is made. Because many of the people who look at proposals come from the hard-headed world of business, they are negatively impressed if you indicate that you can absorb the indirect costs. They recognize indirect costs as real costs. This, obviously, works in the applicant's favor.

Q: Do you have any comment to make about foundations making grants to organizations-- organizations such as the Speech Association?

A: This is a very common kind of activity. Usually, the only requirement for a potential grantee is that he have a nonprofit status established with the Internal Revenue Service. Developmental grants have been made to any number of professional associations. Ordinarily, the professional association does not tend to serve as a broker for individual research projects. I think that the foundation law, if there is one, is that the granting source ought to be as near to the base of control as possible. In a research project, it makes better sense to make the award to the university where it will be done than to the Speech Association, unless there is some real reason for cooperative activity. In the fields of psychology, social work, medicine, and almost any that you can name, there have been large organizational grants made. Some time ago, the Carnegie Foundation made a grant to the American Sociological Society, as it was then called, to make a business-like operation out of itself. They gave them some operating funds for a couple of years, and the organization did indeed put itself in the black. They have since remained independent of such support. This is a rather rare type of grant, but it does happen. Where you are dealing with a collective form of research-- involving a number of universities-- the Speech Association would be a very logical grantee.

-- It takes a good bit of nerve to pose as an expert in this field. You can get a very broad education by spending even an hour with the Foundation Directory. Certainly, it is a useful resource, and certainly, money from private foundations buys just as much as does money from Uncle Sam. Thank you.

LUNCHEON ADDRESS

John W. Bystrom, formerly Assistant to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare (Educational Television.)

RESEARCH AND THE CAPACITY TO MEET SOCIAL CHANGE

When Bill Work was on a recent trip to Washington we visited Resurrection City, that dramatic action designed to communicate the needs of the poor to the nation. Taken along with the many other active expressions of social dissatisfaction, it was part of what can be termed quite appropriately a "social revolution."

Commenting on social disorders, Wilbur Cohen, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, saw a constructive element in them. "We're finding better ways to communicate with each other," he said, "communication, which was falling apart in our society, has now opened up for the first time."

Our social disturbances have raised a question about the effectiveness of our society's "early warning system," at least in its traditional form. Classically, free speech and the right to assemble to listen, free press and the right of distribution-- those activities guaranteed by the First Amendment-- were to provide the information on conditions and attitudes which made it possible for the government to adjust to the needs of the governed.

Surely it was not contemplated that it would be necessary to burn a city down to assure access to information distributing agencies. Yet that is what is argued today. "It takes action to get on TV," it is said. "The media will not pay attention to a speech in a church basement, no matter how well planned. TV audiences no longer react to words alone."

We are currently involved in sorting out the meanings of these communications. What is being said? Why is it being said? And to what part of it should we be listening?

Before meeting Bill that day I had been involved in discussions revolving around the application of communication satellites to the development of health and education. In the field of communication, technology is now on the threshold of forcing enormous and unpredictable social changes. Transistors, integrated circuitry, lasers, satellites, and the combination of tele-communications and the computer create a communication potential which will be limited chiefly by our capacity to manage and use it. The word "communication revolution" is not inappropriate for what has and will take place.

These two revolutions are both the product of technological change. A new urban society-- mobile, disoriented, and urged-on each day to increase consuming aspirations-- has been produced by the automobile and the mass media. Technological change has had its consequences in social change.

There is no place where social change represents a more profound challenge than in the effective use of speech. Millions of people who could once survive in an agrarian society with very limited speech capability are now being asked to survive in an intricate fast-moving urban industrial society which operates only if there is a basic capacity on the part of its members to use and respond to complex and changing symbols. Millions of people are living in tight urban slums where the traditional forms of community problem-solving-- I refer, of course, to the idealized town meeting--are no part of reality.

There are a large number of additional critical areas of educational need which are of deep concern to the Federal government and which involve a need for speech training. I refer to such efforts as: (1) manpower training, (2) preschool education, (3) education of the disadvantaged, (4) personal development of minorities, to name a few.

These populations represent the educational battleground of the 1960s. These efforts, the struggle to tame the leviathan which untamed can bring down the republic. The social and technical changes are placing greater and greater demands on two processes. One is the discovery of new knowledge-- research. The second is the training of citizens to cope with new situations-- instruction. These are the processes by which the speech profession lives.

With the tools of research the nature of speech problems are sought and the best means for meeting the problems are tested. With the tools of instruction new patterns of behavior are developed in the populations that need them.

You here today are teachers. But you have a special responsibility to the nation and to the discipline because you are also managers of research. The capacity of the field to change is basically in your hands.

Speech as an organized discipline was born of midwestern universities in the midst of an agrarian society in which almost all communication was face-to-face communication. It was a far different place in which to live and communicate than today's society.

Any discipline which presumes to deal with individual behavior and social processes must have built into the professional apparatus the information-gathering and dissemination which makes intellectual change possible.

I am constantly running on to efforts which demonstrate the changing requirements for speech instruction. A short time ago I listened with great interest to a group of adult educators from New Mexico explain that speech instruction was the first necessity in the education of adult Mexican Americans before any vocational training could be done. In Washington, D.C. Charles Hurst of Howard University is engaged in a project concerned with low prestige English and substandard speech among Negroes and is developing techniques for improving social and vocational opportunity through changed speech habits.

Lou Kornhauser's language arts program in the District of Columbia schools is a comprehensive effort to develop facility in standard English among Negro youngsters whose daily speech is a dialect form which began among slaves of the old South.

Bill Work showed me a proposal for a program to provide speech communication education to job trainees, to develop behavior related to successful employment.

There are a whole range of such efforts, yet they are not commensurate with the need. They are carried on by English teachers, welfare workers, and Job Corps instructors as well as speech teachers. I think it is fair to say that they do not express a major recognized commitment by the speech field.

A great amount of time now goes into research processes when we consider the man hours of graduate research. There is an enormous potential in Federal funds for the discovery of additional new knowledge. On the management of these resources rests the capacity of the discipline to respond to change.

The capacity to adapt to and control change is what the Federal government is seeking with its investments in research and instruction. This capacity is precisely the need of the speech field. There is an excellent basis for common cause, and for this reason I want to discuss the Federal research posture as I see it and consider with you its implications to the speech field and the capacity of the field to provide useful instruction to those who need it.

The Federal government in its dealings with the problem of change is now looking to the university and to the trained intellectual to assist in social problem solution. In its modern dress the use of the university for research capability in meeting national problem-solving is a development which has taken place essentially in the last decade. Support for research by the Federal government goes back much further, of course, through the agricultural extension service and the land grant tradition.

I think it will surprise you-- it did me-- to hear this statement of Donald Hornig, the President's Science Advisor. Today the costs of scientific inquiry and development carried on by industry, government and the universities "consume one-fourth of the disposable Federal budget." By disposable budget he meant to exclude costs such as debt retirement, veteran's benefits and the like. As for universities specifically, over 30% of the funds flowing to them from the Federal government go to support research. This suggests some kind of confidence in the ability of research methods.

I should add that social and educational research has only a very small part of this pie and has the most difficult time before Congress in justifying itself on the basis of social benefit. Yet in the face of mounting social and educational problems there is a demand for new and better knowledge and support is growing, although slowly.

To maintain some degree of responsiveness to the vast social forces now in motion the government is compelled to make an active effort to learn what in fact is happening, what are the causes, and what methods provide promise of dealing with the problems.

Federal research programs are heavily problem-oriented in response to the requirements of change. The modern Federally supported research program established its character within the framework of military problems. There is a history here worth a moment.

In the belief that the methods which worked for military and health problems have value to the domestic scene, Congressional support is being provided increasingly to attack pressing social problems. These are problems we once failed to recognize or toward which existing efforts, including those by our colleges and universities, have been insufficient. The existing Federal programs for educational and social research have as their lineal antecedents the massive research programs directed to the solution of defense problems. Technologically-centered, these efforts were largely concerned with effective utilization of technology and the application of technological systems for the solution of problems.

The Defense Department had to develop a complex apparatus for achieving independent outside advice. One of the devices was the so-called "think factory." The most publicized of these is Rand.

Rand, a nonprofit corporation, has operated for twenty years. It is one of perhaps two dozen major think operations. Its staff of eleven hundred included over five hundred researchers and two hundred Ph.Ds. All types of disciplines are represented. Its annual budget is $23 million. The think factories were designed to provide the thought and research needed for specified objectives. This was something the university had difficulty in doing. Federally sponsered research, much of it at least, required certain capabilities which the think factories were able to provide.

A multidisciplined approach was essential. Technological change involved a range of consequences. The introduction of new technology has often changed both social organization and individual behavior. Problem-solution benefited from the viewpoint of anthropoligists, sociologists, psychologists, as well as the electrical and mechanical engineers. This characteristic is now being carried into the study of social and educational problems.

A second characteristic of Federally supported research is that the effort is most often decision-oriented. The reaction of the Federal government to change has increased the numbers of decisions required. As a result, great attention is being given to decision-making processes and to the encouragement of new knowledge needed for problem solution.

Because R and D was decision-oriented, techniques were developed to measure effectiveness of alternative solutions. This is a third characteristic. Today attention is being focused on measuring the social and operating effectiveness of expenditures. The word "cost-benefit" does not as yet panic the HEW administrator to the degree we are led to believe it did the inhabitants of the Pentagon. However, there is an Assistant Secretary of HEW-- and a very bright staff-- whose sole function is to apply the techniques of PPBS (Program Planning Budget System) to determine the effectiveness of social programs administered by the department.

The research and advice-seeking efforts of the Federal government reflect the planning ideal toward which the executive branch is now working. It goes something like this: Objectives are defined. Priorities determined among the various objectives. Various strategies for achieving these objectives are developed. The various options are analyzed with the benefits measured against the cost. The most promising may be field tested on a pilot basis, and, finally, action taken along the lines of the selected strategy. (The speech man will recognize in government planning efforts Dewey's problem-solving sequence in a new guise.)

Not everyone shares this aim or has the same degree of conviction about the process.Congress approaches R and D with some skepticism. It is shared by many administrators, particularly those with social program responsibilities.

Decisions will continue to reflect political pressures and special interest demands. Subsidies to tobacco growers will continue to be greater than support for anti-smoking efforts for sometime to come. Nevertheless, I would guess that to the degree that social effectiveness can be shown for research efforts, expenditures will increase.

I do not know that speech departments are getting their share of the R and D dollar. I suspect they are not. I recall that several years ago I reviewed some five years of Federal grants under Title VII of the National Defense Education Act. This program had special interest for speech because it supported research and demonstrations in the use of the newer educational media-- television, radio, film, programmed instruction. Out of a total of 250 projects less than a dozen had been directed by persons holding speech department positions.

The university department should recognize that it is in competition today with the Rand type corporation, the independent university research institute, and with private industry for research dollars. Furthermore, that the university department has allowed some doubts to develop among the managers of research grants about its capability for effective mission-oriented research. It has been slow and notably unreliable in meeting completion dates, allowing the impression to develop that professors go off freely to urgent assignments on the Riviera or Tahiti while cities burn and social problems are expected to wait on their return.

After reviewing the record of the major Congressional committees involved in research policy, Don Kash of Purdue has concluded, "Congress is convinced it needs public policy help. It believes the universities have the creative talent to give it." However, it also believes that "at present the universities are inadequately organized to offer the help."

Speech departments have responded to the massive infusion of Federal research and development funds in the traditional university manner. The direction of research and future planning is controlled essentially by the activities of individual faculty members arranged by individual agreements who take on Federal projects.

I think it is fair to say that for the most part the speech department as a research organization cannot meet the specifications required for research into the major social problems brought about by change. By definition it is not truly multidisciplined, although there is a great diversity of interests within a typical department faculty. It is a response largely to the inner directions of the research managers rather than the decision requirements of organized groups. And it lacks the continuity, manpower, and social mobility to easily study a range of alternatives in various settings over a period of time. From the standpoint of the department, major projects extending over several years may seriously disturb department balance if undertaken without outside assistance.

The regional research laboratories financed by the Office of Education and the regional medical program of the Public Health Service are responses to the need for interdisciplinary problem-oriented research capability.

Yet from the standpoint of the speech profession-- and its need to change methods and adapt to new social requirements-- there are compelling reasons why the department and the professional should retain an important role in research. The university department has at its command the resources to encourage introduction of new practices into the educational system. It must be willing to participate in the long-term strategy and design necessary. A Rand Corporation, admittedly, has no capability to gain the consent of the institutions of instruction or to do the job dictated by new knowledge. The recognition is slowly developing that to introduce change into the command-structure of the military is a more simple matter than it is to introduce it into our overlapping, decentralized political and educational systems-- the nearly thirty thousand independent school districts, the 2,200 more or less autonomous institutions of higher education.

If instruction is to change, the discipline itself must have the capacity to change. The department of speech has an important leadership role to play in this process. Probably it will perform in that role best if it is involved in the actual work of problem analysis and solution.

One approach to give the university department some of the flexibility required for Federally supported research is the consortium involving several universities. This makes easy the sharing of staff, opens up varied experimental settings, and assures a higher degree of continuity. There are a variety of ways in which the consortium can operate:

-- One university can become the business manager with responsibilities delegated to it by other participants.

-- Universities and the professional association can jointly work together with the department called in on a case basis.

-- In some instances a separate corporate entity has been established.

There is the possibility of utilizing some existing framework such as CIC (Midwest's Committee on Institutional Cooperation), or interstate compact groups such as SREB (Southern Regional Education Board) and WICHE (Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education).

Perhaps the best way to begin is with a joint work assignment. The first step is to define a pressing social problem area. Having had some successful experience, the chance for a stable relationship is much improved.

More than interdepartmental cooperation in research will be needed, however, if the speech discipline is to make the contribution to the solution of current national problems it should make and presumes to make on occasion. The strength in a discipline based approach, may I repeat, is this. If social problems are to be solved it is not enough to develop new knowledge. The working level must know about it and accept the change advocated. The obligation of a professional is not only to recommend, he should be prepared to carry out the recommendations through organized instruction. He controls the capacity to meet the objectives.

In addition to a research strategy, a strategy for instruction needs to be developed. Methods need to be explored for assuring the prompt application of new knowledge and the extension of instruction where needed. To participate in the instruction strategy the university must be part of a team. The college department does not presume to cover the spectrum of speech instruction. The team needs the public schools, economic opportunity programs, corporations, business associations. These are the kinds of organizations able to deliver the instruction when it is needed where it is needed. The team also requires the training institutions, the schools of education, the churches, neighborhood clubs, welfare organizations. These are the kinds of organizations able to recruit the teaching manpower and demand that it be trained.

Here again, however, the university department working alone has limitations. Individual departments can have continuing influence in one State. They can produce outstanding ad hoc projects, but any long term systematic national approach to an instructional arrangement will require a national strategy backed by national planning. Speech instruction in some instances, for example, may have to be provided in the field through instruction by non majors. Delegation of some aspect of speech instruction goals to teachers of English, teachers of vocational education, or neighborhood group leaders will have to be considered. Any such negotiations must be carried out at a national level. The research needed to determine the effectiveness of instruction under the new arrangement should not be repeated over and over, State by State. It, too, can benefit from a national approach. The department cannot depend on its own efforts alone or on a consortium; a clearly focused national effort is necessary, perhaps based in the Speech Association, but drawing on the leadership and abilities to be found in the separate departments.

In short, the departments, when backed by cooperative efforts, can perform as the basic resource in meeting the social requirements. They can become part of an integrated and comprehensive program beginning with research and culminating in the application of new knowledge to the improvement of instruction and educational opportunity.

Thus far I have talked about procedures and practices. This is without point if the goal toward which our activities are to be directed has not been determined.

The only educational commitment in these times is this: To provide speech instruction which meets the needs of all citizens. Not only those who qualify for college and are accepted for speech fundamentals. Not only those who qualify for high school enrichment programs. Today, the ideal of service to all Americans is beyond the capacity of our methods or operations, but its recognition could channel and shape the resources we have and make more effective use of them. If the nation becomes our commitment, it must be followed by a determination of specific objectives and priorities for we are surely unprepared for the task. Major goals will require phased actions and subgoals extending over many years.

The process that is being suggested is that now being pressed within the Federal government: A determination of needs, a selection of objectives and priorities, a review of alternatives and a selection of the best alternatives.

Speech needs a center of focus for this leadership to bring to bear the resources of our major departments in a coherent national effort. Such a center might properly be in the Association. It is growing each year in its capacities. The new Director of Research is an example. However it still lacks the resources for the effort envisioned here.

In the speech field today there is strong personal leadership, but it is divided by our almost total reliance on individual and department goals. A focused national direction would obviously have no coercive force to it. It would depend for persuasiveness on the quality of the effort. It would construct a view of the national requirements for speech instruction against which individuals and units could examine the functional value of their efforts. Graduate research might well become more socially productive, and a clearer sense of purpose could be introduced into instructional activities.

In one way or another a focus on the nation's need has gotten underway in a number of professional areas during the past five years. I would like to discuss a few of these efforts which may have application to speech.

Some years back the mathematicians undertook to change the status and the teaching of mathematics in the public schools. They faced a serious problem in improving instruction. Mathematics was one of those subjects that Phy Ed majors offered to teach in order to achieve a coaching position. The text books mirrored the needs of an agrarian society, yet this was the space age. The mathematicians observed the success of the physicist in developing a new national curriculum. With the support of the National Science Foundation they set up drafting teams involving the outstanding thinkers of the field and set about to shape a new curriculum-- the "new math."

I became familiar with the project when I was on the State Board of Education in Minnesota. We proposed that the State be an experimental laboratory for the first drafts of the new materials. Mathematics teachers, several hundred of them, were chosen each year and each was paid an annual consulting fee of $1000. For this they used the newly drafted curriculum materials and reported their reactions. The result was rapid statewide adoption of the new math, increased status for mathematics, and an improved, more workable curriculum.

Over the last several years we have seen the success of Project English under the direction of the National Council of Teachers of English. You are all familiar with it, and I won't go into detail. The title of their report is worth repeating, The NATIONAL INTEREST and the Teaching of English. It makes clear the scope of the effort. This has been no piecemeal, one-shot proposal but an effort to examine the whole of the nation's needs for instruction in English and then follow through on the recommendations.

The Music Educators National Conference of the NEA is administering several projects to strengthen the teaching of music on all levels, from elementary to postgraduate. With approximately $1.5 million in Ford Foundation grants they have established a half-dozen regional institutes for the evaluation of new techniques in music instruction. The regions, while consisting of a large number of schools and colleges, are headquartered in a leading university of the area.

The American Industrial Arts Association has undertaken a major review of industrial arts instruction. They established a National Commission on Industrial Arts Education. On it were placed representatives of the public, government, and industry. The make-up of the commission is worth noting. It went outside the field of instruction and drew some of the members from those who could represent society and its requirements.

Another approach which permits greater flexibility and allows for a national view is the establishment of an independent research center. In some instances a center has been inspired by the professional association. This independent nonprofit corporation has quick response, autonomy, and new maneuverability. The Center for Applied Linguistics is separate from the Linguistic Society of America. It has a number of grants and contracts involving the solution of social problems where the techniques of the linguists are of value.

One of them is a language attitude study. It focuses on the Negro, now in the urban centers formerly of a southern rural environment. Washington and Detroit are the locations for the study, but the results can have a profound effect on the millions of Americans who are occupationally and socially handicapped because of low status speech.

In an area of special interest to me, educational television, future growth was inhibited by a lack of funds. The educational television station as an institution had developed late and did not have the access to fixed sources of tax revenue, as was the case for libraries and schools. For sometime conversations were carried on between the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Federal Communication Commission concerning a jointly-sponsered study group to be made up of leading citizens to determine next steps in the development of this important medium. However, because of the deep concern and fear of Federal interference in communication operations it was recognized that a private non-government body would be more desirable. The Carnegie Corporation of New York agreed to fund such a study. Membership was chosen from those outside government, and-- this may come as a surprise-- entirely from those outside the educational television operations. There were several leading commercial broadcasters on the commission. It spent over a year in deliberation, and in its report provided a new vision for ETV and a new basis for operation. The report was never once attacked as a self-serving document. A law authorizing a Public Broadcasting Corporation, which was at the core of the commission's recommendation, passed Congress less than ten months after the report was issued. The supporters of educational television have united around the proposed strategy for national development, and it is now a basis for unified action.

Each of the actions I have mentioned have been different. But they have had this in common: They have considered current practices against a conception of national need, and they have sought to adapt an educational process to changing requirements.

What precise action might best serve the speech field, I'm not prepared to say. However, as a member of the Association it may not be out of place for one to express an opinion as to the direction to be taken by the field.

Basically, there must be a higher degree of concern expressed for social benefits and for the needs of all of the nation's population. If we effictively attack basic social problems we can look for generous support from the Federal government.

We need a built in capacity to adapt to new social and technical circumstances. Expertise is not lacking. What is needed is greater emphasis on organizational practices which will bring the expertise to bear where needed, with sufficient scope and authority. The individual department is in many ways inadeqquate to the task. However, it can initiate cooperative practices which can strengthen the field.

As a field we should be quite certain that we have well-developed machinery for determining our objectives and assessing our methods for reaching them. We should be capable of prompt adaption to new instructional demands. I am convinced that we do not have that mechanism today.

This conference, the conference last winter, the new post of Director of Research in the Association, express the active role in research and development which the Association must plan in bringing focus to the diverse activities in speech. We are fortunate in having an exceptionally able Executive Secretary and a progressive group of officers. With the resources we now have we should develop a national policy for speech instruction and the improvement of communication in the United States.

Douglas Ehninger in his President's column in the February Spectra asked the question: Should the Association be primarily a member service organization, or should it take on a role of intellectual leadership? Doug Ehninger, I cast my vote for leadership. The Speech Association of America can appropriately be the point of national focus which is now badly needed. It can take on expanded responsibilities for coordination, drawing on the institutional resources of the field. To paraphrase a famous statement: Ask not what the Association can do for the profession, but rather, what can the Association and the profession do for society? The forces of technical and social change demand from us a capacity for change and for new services. We must develop the techniques which permit us to adapt to new circumstances.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak today. I look forward to staying and will listen with great personal interest to the new directions of research and practices to be discussed today and tomorrow.

REFERENCES

Quotations: Wilbur Cohen from New York Times Magazine, June 23, 1968; Don E. Kash from "Research and Development at the University" Science, June 21, 1968; Donald F. Hornig from speech at Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pa., May 10, 1968. For further information on PPBS see Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations, Senate Committee on Government Operations, Planning-Programming-Budgeting, Selected Comments, also print on PPB Official Document, 90 Cong. 1 Sess., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967. For further information on government research policy see: Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee, House Committee on Government Operations, The Use of Social Research in Federal Domestic Programs Part I, 90 Cong. 1 Sess., (U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1967), House Select Committee on Government Research, National Goals and Policies, 88 Cong. 2 Sess., (U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1956). House Committee on Government Operations, Federal Research and Development Programs, 89 Cong. 2 Sess. (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1966).

REPORT OF THE RHETORIC CONFERENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Lloyd Bitzer, Chairman

Early last spring, the Research Board authorized creation of a committee charged with planning a conference on rhetoric, a major meeting of scholars of rhetoric representing various fields, whose papers, discussions and recommendations would significantly advance rhetorical studies. It was anticipated that a conference of this sort would receive financial support. I was asked to serve as Chairman; the other committee members are Carroll Arnold of Pennsylvania State University, James J. Murphy of the University of California at Davis, and Gerald Miller of Michigan State University. The Committee met here in Chicago this last June 1 and 2. Bill Work and Jim Roever met with us. The Committee addressed itself to the task of formulating tentative objectives and a tentative format for the conference. In reporting the outcomes of these deliberations, let me emphasize that our plans are still tentative and subject to considerable modification. First, we propose a preliminary conference and a main conference designed to outline and amplify a conception of rhetoric suitable to 20th century concepts, learnings, and needs. The preliminary conference would involve a relatively small number of people-- perhaps a dozen. It would have as its major objectives: 1). To assess current rhetorical theory in view of contemporary social problems, new concepts and information related to rhetorical processes, and persistent issues; and 2). to identify concepts, issues, lines of research, and practices which should receive priority attention by scholars, teachers , and administrators of rhetorical studies. The format of the preliminary conference would be roughly as follows: Several months prior to the preliminary conference, perhaps a half dozen scholars would be asked to develop broad and penetrating analyses of present scholarship in rhetoric. They would be asked to write position papers in response to the following: What is the essential outline of a conception of rhetoric needed for the second half of the 20th century? Each writer would also be asked to amplify one section of his outline. It is our assumption that this process would result in several useful position papers. Approximately three months prior to this preliminary conference, the position papers would be sent to an equal number of critics who would be asked to critique the papers, and, if they choose, to form their own outline of a contemporary rhetoric. One month prior to the conference, the critics' responses would be distributed to all participants-- those who formulated the position papers as well as to the fellow-critics. All of these persons would then assemble at the preliminary conference and engage in a general critique of the position papers submitted and the critical responses to them. This preliminay conference would be approximately of two days' duration. Its working sessions would in effect be an agenda for the main conference.

-- Immediately following the preliminary conference, the steering committee would meet in order to organize materials to be submitted to the participants in the main conference. The preliminary conference is conceived as interdisciplinary, drawing about one half of its participants from the field of speech and the remainder from such areas as literary criticism, philosophy, social science, linguistics, history, and the like. Most of the position papers will be solicited from scholars in speech, the assumption being persons actively engaged in rhetorical scholarship are in the best position to chart the course. Most of the responding critics would be drawn from cognate disciplines, the assumption being that they are best prepared to comment on those topics and issues where rhetoric and cognate subjects conjoin.

-- The main conference will probably involve from 24 to 30 participants. The general function of the main conference will be to stimulate productive deliberation centered upon but not restricted to the documents transmitted from the preliminary conference. The conferees will be charged with formulating quite specific recommendations on research and all of the important aspects of the field of rhetoric. The three major objectives of the main conference would be as follows: 1). To discover implications for educational programs, particularly graduate programs, and formulate related recommendations; 2). To lay out the directions and priorities for research; and 3). To identify, clarify, and amplify the theoretical issues requiring resolution. Closely related to these three objectives are two themes: 1). The social relevance of rhetorical studies; and 2). The relationships among disciplines contributing to these studies.

-- A few weeks in advance of the main conference, a package of materials extracted from the preliminary conference would be sent to all participants. The conference would begin on a Sunday evening and would conclude at noon on the following Friday. The pattern of meetings will be modeled closely after the pattern used in the New Orleans conference. Roughly 30 participants from the field of speech would be selected according to the following criteria: 1). Most should be promising scholars under 40 years of age; 2). They should represent several areas of research-- rhetorical theory, rhetorical criticism, speech behavior, pedagogy; 3). They should be persons who are in position or who will be in position to institute changes in their own departments; 4). If possible, there should be geographical distribution of participants; 5). No more than one participant should be chosen from an individual university; and 6). Conferees must be willing to commit themselves to participation in the conference from beginning to end. If any of you are interested, I can supply additional details about the proposed final conference format.

-- In closing, I would like to emphasize that all of us who are serving on this Committee will welcome your suggestions relative to the content, format, and personnel of this project.

REPORT OF THE RESEARCH INFORMATION RETRIEVAL COMMITTEE

Reported by Kenneth Frandsen for Chairman, Larry Barker

The members of the Research Information Retrieval Committee are: Edwin Black, University of Wisconsin; George Borden, Pennsylvania State University; Gary Cronkhite, Illinois State University; Brad Lashbrook, Michigan State University; Larry Barker, Chairman, Purdue University; plus myself and our ex officio member, Jim Roever. We had our first face-to-face confrontation last night; the ink on our first set of recommendations is not yet dry. My remarks this afternoon will, perforce, be very general.

-- As we perceive the work of the committee, our task is to look at alternative ways for getting more information to more people more quickly and efficiently than we have been able to in the past. We are looking at some computer systems which may be capable of accomplishing our objectives. There are a number of problems that face us, not the least of which is the question of the boundaries of our field of interest. Where do we draw the lines between what is provided by an information retrieval system, and what we leave to the individual to search for on his own? Another problem centers around taxonomy. How should we classify materials? What are the categories that are likely to prove most useful to large numbers of people? How can we adequately "tag" items that might be wanted through a simplified, manageable request form? Underlying all of these questions, of course, is the question of the selection of the most practical technological means for accomplishing our ends.

-- The committee will welcome any suggestions that you may have and, in particular, we are interested in knowing the kinds of information requests that you would make, if a reasonably sophisticated retrieval system were available to you. You might, for example, be particularly interested in bibliographic information, or in research reports, or in descriptions of developmental projects. This kind of information will help us to do a better job of designing or finding the system that will serve your needs. Chairman Larry Barker at Purdue University-- or any member of the Committee-- will welcome the benefit of your thinking.

REPORT OF THE EDUCATIONAL POLICIES BOARD

Ronald Reid, member of the Board

Insofar as the main thrust of today's conference is on research, the work of the Educational Policies Board may be viewed as somewhat tangential. The Board was created in part, at least, in response to problems arising from the fact that SAA had no central body to deal with matters of educational policy. In creating the Board, it was the desire of the Administrative Council to provide such a central body that could, among other things, serve to coordinate Association activities in speech education growing out of various Interest Groups and committees. The Board came into official being at the December convention this last year.

-- The Board has been given a broad charge. Some of its functions are: 1). To formulate SAA policy relating to speech education and to recommend such policies for action to the Administrative Council or to appropriate Interest Groups; 2). To identify problems in speech education in conjunction with appropriate Interest Groups and recommending or implementing specific programs to meet these problems. As you can see, it is a broad charge. The Board has met once to develop an outline for future plans and activities. Rightly or wrongly, the Board decided to focus first on secondary school speech education. We are concerned about elementary school education and undergraduate education as well, but a consensus was expressed that top priority should be given to speech programs in the secondary schools. Within this general area, three somewhat overlapping topics of particular concern were identified. One is concerned with teacher preparation, one is concerned with curriculum, and the third is concerned with developing information about what is actually happening in secondary schools. Quite clearly, it is difficult to deal with any one of these topics in a fully discrete manner.

-- First, a word about certification. Although some of you may not be aware of it, a certification document was adopted by the Association in 1963. The specification of teacher competencies in this document is quite broad. Furthermore, the document suggests a minimum of 18 semester hours of appropriate course work as the means whereby teacher candidates will achieve these competencies. Our initial reaction is that the scope of the recommended competencies is a bit broad and that the recommended training program is insufficient. In attempting to revise this 1963 statement, we hope to work cooperatively with the American Educational Theatre Association. We have already received some indication of that organization's interest in this matter.

-- Quite apart from the substantive recommendations of a certification document, there are important questions revolving around the manner in which the document is constructed. It is one thing to produce a document, and quite another to have that document effect change. We are looking closely at the recent English Teacher Preparation Study as a possible model. That particular study involved the National Council of Teachers of English, the Modern Language Association, and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. The latter are the certification officers in the several States. We hope that we can draw up a document that will not only receive SAA approval, but that will also earn support among persons who figure importantly in the administration of certification standards.

-- With reference to the Board's concern for curriculum, I was interested in Dr. Bystrom's remark that we really need to define what speech instruction is in this country. We are in the process of going over a variety of teacher guides, curriculum guides, and similar materials which have been prepared by State associations, by regional associations, by State Departments of Public Instruction, and so on. We are considering the possibility of recommending that SAA either draw up its own curriculum document or that it adopt a policy relative to endorsing existing or future documents. We have only engaged in very preliminary thinking in this whole area of curriculum.

-- As far as finding out what is going on in secondary schools is concerned, we can report-- without taking any credit for it-- that a study at Indiana University is presently being planned that will give us a national picture of just what is taking place in speech in secondary schools. The Board proposes to consult with the investigator relative to the kinds of information that will be sought in the study. The findings should prove very valuable to the Board and to the profession.

-- These, then, are some of the things about which we have been thinking and deliberating. You may expect us to come up with more specific recommendations, hopefully some of them in time for consideration at the December convention. The Board welcomes comments, criticisms, and suggestions from all members of SAA. The Chairman is Rupert Cortright at Wayne State University; the members in addition to myself are Dorothy Weirich of Webster Groves Senior High School in Missouri, and Malcolm Sillars of San Fernando Valley State College.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE SAA-USOE NEW ORLEANS CONFERENCE

Work: John Dietrich, who served as Director of the Project was originally scheduled to review for you the background of the New Orleans Conference. He and I agreed that its origins and scope have been well publicized. Since we are now in a position to assess some of the outcomes of the meetings held in New Orleans this last February, I will be brief. The Project grew out of a trip to Washington, D.C. that Jeff Auer and I made to protest the substantial non-inclusion of speech in "Project English." We learned that Federal money was available for discipline-oriented research and instructional development projects. Ultimately, through the SAA Research Board and the advisory committee which it selected, a specific USOE sponsoring agency-- the Arts and Humanities Program-- was located, a proposal was drawn up, and some $58,000 in government support was secured. The total process-- with all of the attendant problems of selecting a focus, writing by committee, choosing conference personnel,-- took almost three years. We hope to make the full project report available in the fall. Our purpose today is to hear and discuss reactions to the New Orleans conference recommendations by representatives of three areas of speech-communication scholarship: historical, critical, and behavioral.

Implications of the New Orleans Conference Recommendations From the Perspective of Historical Scholarship-- J. J. Auer, Indiana U.

The ultimate goal of the historian is to earn the accolade given by the ancient rhetorician Longinus to Herodotus: "He takes you along and turns hearing into sight." Or, to put Longinus into the modern idiom, "He tells it like it is, baby!" If, for the purpose of meeting today's assignment I am going to make like an historical scholar, and tell it like it is about the New Orleans conference, I must begin by providing some kind of historical framework for my observations.

It is commonplace to say that for reasons practical, cultural, scientific, or aesthetic, teachers and scholars in the field of speech-communication are concerned with both the act and the art of man communicating with man. This is so whether our main area of interest is theatre, or interpretation, radio-television-film, speech and hearing science and therapy, or public address and group communication. We ignore neither the act nor the art, although we do not always distinguish clearly enough between the two.

The act of speech is simple vocal utterance. It may be performed by the untutored, albeit often crudely and ineffectively, by those schooled in the art who are presumably doing it effectivel intelligently, and responsibly. But since man first communicated with man, the act has always engendered the art. As R. C. Jebb affirmed this in his treatment of the Attic Orators: "It was of the essence of Greek oratory...that its practice should be connected with a theory. Art is the application of rules, generalised from experience, for the production of results; and the Greek conception of speaking as an art implied a Rhetoric. This Rhetoric grew only gradually into a complete system; but from the first there was the fixed tendency to regard oratorical composition as susceptible of a regular analysis."

What Jebb is saying, and implying, is that there were speakers before there was an art or theory of speaking, and no doubt actors before there was an art of acting. In effect, we must agree that genetically the practitioners came first. Then came the theorists. Aristotle put it this way in his Rhetoric: "When the practiced and the spontaneous speaker gain their end, it is possible to investigate the cause of their success; and such an inquiry, we shall all admit, performs the function of an art." Aristotle might have said that we begin with the empirical and move toward the technical or the scientific. Or that the unschooled act of oral communication may reflect only native ingenuity, but that the art of effective communication is based upon a compend of deliberate analysis. This was pretty much Jebb's conclusion when he was writing the history of empirical Asianism, and technical Atticism. "The Old Oratory (Atticism) was an art," he said, "and was therefore based upon a theory. The New Oratory (Asianism) was a knack, and was founded upon practice...The flourishing period of Asianism was that during which the whole training of the rhetor consisted in declamation. The revival of Atticism dates from the moment when attention was recalled to theory."

Finally, after the practitioners and the theorists, came the critics, and the historians. Or perhaps we should simply say that the critics are always with us. At least it is true that at about the same time that Aristotle wrote his Rhetoric, Pliny in his Natural History quoted Zeuxis as complaining that "criticism comes easier than craftsmanship." Both the historian and the critic stand, in a way, upon the shoulders of the theorists, and reach for value judgments of the social impact and worth of specific acts of communication. These judgments are set forth in what Allan Nevins traditionally defined as "any integrated narrative or description of past events or facts written in a spirit of critical inquiry for the whole truth." These judgments are made by following what is commonly referred to as the historical, or the critical, method of research. Because among scholars in our field it is not uncommon for those employing the historical method to embrace both history and criticism in their studies, Professor Arnold and I thought it might be helpful to establish some boundary lines for the purposes of today's meeting. We are agreed that a critical study is intensively analytical and focused upon source-message-receiver relationships primarily as they are revealed by the message itself. We are also agreed that a historical study is broader in scope and focused upon source-message-receiver relationships primarily as they are revealed by and within their social, cultural, and intellectual environment. In short, we have made an easy division of the territory wherein the historical scholar takes the rhetorical context, and the critical scholar takes the analysis of discourse per se.

Now, within this construct of practice, theory, history, and criticism, how did the New Orleans conference sound to me?

Let me begin with the conference's basic definition: "Spoken symbolic interaction is the central focus of study in the speech-communication area." No quarrel here by the historian, surely, for even if he makes the point that the zeitgeist of the communicative act is not specifically mentioned, the use of the term "central focus" in the definition will not only make room for the student of zeitgeist, but indicate an area where behaviorist and historian may profitably meet.

This possibility of a research relationship becomes more clear when we read the following three sentences from the conference report: "The conferees recognized that most paradigms of symbolic communication include variables falling into the following classes: physical environment, social environment, source message, channel, code, noise, and receiver. The participants emphasized that their principal concern was with the classes of variables central to speech-communication processes, the variables involved directly in communication exchanges. In this connection, participants noted that their strongest interest was in perceptual rather than physical variables." As I read these sentences, what I have called the rhetorical context classes of variables are of lesser concern, apparently, to the behavioral investigator, but of greater concern to the historical investigator. This congenial conclusion is supported, it seems to me, by the further conference statement that "research in speech communication focuses on the ways in which messages link participants during interaction." Surely the historian, dealing with communication situations outside of the laboratory, is equally concerned with what the conference report calls "the behavioral antecedents and consequences of messages and their variations..."

As a second focus for my reactions, let me note that in several of the resolutions adopted by the conference, speech-communication scholars are saying, in effect: "look at the world around you, and do at least some of your research on the communication dimensions of current social problems." And several other resolutions urged these scholars to get themselves involved in the world around them by applying their research findings to the solution of contemporary and social problems. There was a day, surely, when the historian tried so hard to be "then-minded" that he was indeed almost "out of this world." Today, there are still those who insist that no orator is fair game for study unless he has been comfortably buried for twenty years or more. But in all, I would hazard that the number of persons concerned with "contemporary history," with the here and now, is increasing substantially. And surely they, among the historical brethren, will be among the first to respond to and support the New Orleans conference's call to arms for an engagement with contemporary social problems. And there will just as surely be a special place for their special competencies. For of all problem areas in which we might become involved, it is in meeting the always urgent and sometimes ugly problems of the present that there is often no time to design the research, no time to develop the measures, no time to test the hypotheses. Indeed, there may barely be time to make quick value judgments about the probable utility of existing theories, and to make operational what the historian's perspective tells him is the best thing to do.

Finally, and perhaps a little reluctantly, I come now to a third major emphasis of New Orleans, and reveal an apparent incompatibility between behavioral and historical approaches. Please note that I am less than categorical here, and stress that the incompatibility is apparent. To this point, I shall return in a minute. The emphasis that seems to separate the behavioral and historical scholar is upon what the conference calls "scientific approaches." One conferee quoted in the report defines this approach as "an attempt to establish lawful relationships between antecedents and their consequences in such a way as to enable prediction and replication." And the report suggests that most conferees would endorse as a fairly standard definition that by Fred Kerlinger in his Foundations of Behavioral Research: "Scientific research is systematic, controlled, empirical, and critical investigation of hypothetical propositions about the presumed relations among natural phenomena." I need go no further in defining what the behavioral researcher emphasizes in his search for answers to questions of fact, in his quantitative studies, and in using the experimental method. It is clear that the historical scholar, rumbling around in the campaign of 1868, studying the speechmaking of Patrick Henry, or the oratory of the Free Speech movement at Berkeley, is not likely to become involved with controls or replications as he handles his hypotheses. His kind of data determines his method and consequently for the historian, as Jacques Barzun puts it, "truth rests not on possibility nor on plausibility but on probability."

May I now return to my earlier emphasis upon the term "apparent incompatibility." All that I have just said is true for many historians, in and out of the field of speech-communication, and they will continue to employ their traditional methodologies, especially when concerned with concrete and visible events. But certainly there are other historians, in and out of the field of speech-communication, who have discovered that while the law of uniqueness in history has not been repealed, many facts are still similar enough to permit grouping and counting. They have begun to apply quantification to much of their data, grouping similar facts and manipulating them mathematically. They have found that some of the quantitative techniques commonly applied by the behavioral and social scientists in the study of contemporary behavior are helpful to them in analyzing human behavior in the past. There is not time to detail samples of the historians' use of quantitative methods, content analysis, historical demographic analyses, computer simulation of political groups, and so on. But for a quick overview you might read Walter Nugent's Creative History (1967), and for a more elaborate treatment Edward Saveth's American History and the Social Sciences (1964). What has proved true for a wide range of economic, social, political, and intellectual historians is, in my judgment, going to prove true also for increasing numbers of historians of rhetoric and public address. They are going to discover the utility of quantitative techniques for handling certain kinds of data, and to the extent that they are able to do so they will strengthen the probabilities with which they deal, and they will improve the quality of the value judgments they make.

In this short series of comments, I trust no detailed summary is necessary. But a couple of parting shots are in order. Shot Number One: I believe that even for the historian of the past, and especially for the historian of the contemporary scene, behavioral methods and quantitative techniques are one of the waves of the future. I believe that when the nature of the available data permits it, both historian and critic have an intellectual obligation to employ these methods and techniques as essential complements to more traditional historical methods and critical techniques. Shot Number Two: Since I do so believe, as a result of my own study of research methods in the field of speech, I find both useful and encouraging many of the conclusions reached by the New Orleans conferees. And I do not find, even while temporarily wearing the historian's robe, any ideological or substantive conflict. I would not want to press too far any analogy with the story of the several blind men who examined an elephant, but I must voice my opinion that whenever we can build additional rigor into our research by incorporating more than one approach, we must seize the opportunity. And parting Shot Number Three is this: To my behavioral friends I must say that even as some of you are impatient with those who hold too tightly to the traditional methods, just because they are traditional, so some of my historian friends resist the newer scientific methods, just because they are new. Before a speech-oriented audience may I say that I have heard a great deal of lip-service paid to the notion that scientists and humanists, behavioral and historical scholars, could work together, or at the very least, complement each other, in seeking new insights about speech-communication. It is too much to expect that a conference such as ours at New Orleans could work out specific projects translating that pious hope into present practice. And that is why, ladies and gentlemen, both behavioral and historical scholars still have much homework to do.

Implications of the New Orleans Conference Recommendations From the Perspective of Critical Scholarship-- Carroll C. Arnold, Pennsylvania State University.

I consider the New Orleans Conference and its forthcoming volume of "Proceedings" major achievements in that they offer definition and direction to our academic and research-oriented functions. Of particular significance are the words used to identify the business of all associated in the Speech Association of America: "to understand spoken, symbolic interaction." These terms were considered at length in New Orleans, and I think we will profit from meditating upon the implications of the phrase. What is called for here in teaching and research? Enlargement of understanding. But the understanding most highly prized is not understanding of oratory or drama or speech disorders or the mass media *per se*. The conferees at New Orleans have said that their primary business is to attain understanding of the human experiences that occur when speech links (or separates) man and man in whatever setting. I take them to say also, chiefly by implication, that this ought to be my primary business too.

As one who fancies himself a rhetorician and rhetorical critic I hope I speak for my kind in saying that the New Orleans Conference identified for primary attention precisely the kind of human experience which rhetorical theory at its best seeks to describe and which rhetorical criticism at its best seeks to analyze. I see no distinction between what the Conference recommends as an ideal focus for scientific investigation and what I would consider the ideal objective of rhetorical or dramatistic or therapeutic description and critical exploration. Criticism is at base an attempt to apply theory and hypotheses in interpreting discourse for the purpose of better explicating the entire spoken, symbolic interaction one is investigating.

Critics try as best they can, with whatever knowledge and educated guesses they can lay hands on, to comment significantly on the nature and quality of whole communicative events. They may have scientific data, and theoretical constructs that have been scientifically tested, by which to explain some features of the speaking they look at; but where they can't be sure that rhetorical feature A will lawfully generate consequence B, they must reason out hypotheses of their own on the bases of experience or of theory as yet untested, or they may try to open themselves to those kinds of original, creative insights we have all experienced but cannot account for methodologically. A critic thus stands, as Auer has just said, on the shoulders of the scientist--and sometimes, of course, on the shoulders of the historian, the literary artist, or someone else. In their turn, critics who do their work well supply scientists and others with new hypotheses to be tested under controlled conditions.

On the basis of such views of the reciprocity among scholarly methods, I say as an outlander to the behavioral sciences that the New Orleans Conference may well be the most important event in the history of the Speech Association of America. Why? Because it resulted in a long-needed, clear statement of why we exist, and it produced a valuable statement on priorities in research. We exist as an association of scholars because of our special wish to understand better the nature and consequences of spoken, symbolic interaction. This is what held our colleagues together in New Orleans and they suggest it can and ought to be the bond of our profession.

But the New Orleans Conference did more than produce a tag by which to designate our common interest. The Conference was specially concerned with the kinds of research required of us by this search for understanding. From a critical point of view, the conferees were exactly right when they said the two general kinds of research we most need just now are: research that clarifies the concepts we use when we try to explain what spoken, symbolic interaction is and research designed to fill in gaps in the theoretical and conceptual systems we adopt when trying to explain or predict how some features of communication interplay with and relate to other features under the conditions of orality. The more precise concepts and tighter theoretical constructs the conferees said we must seek are precisely what I need as I try to perform what I think are the functions of a rhetorical critic. From my viewpoint, then, the Conference urged that research be directed toward just such theoretical matters as are most important if scholars of my kind are to do our work better.

The detailed priorities set forth in the report also seem to me necessary if critical perceptions of spoken rhetoric are to become humanly significant. Recommendation 28 ends by saying that we need special efforts at developing the outlines of speech-communication theories. I fear that is only too true. One hears much talk of rhetorical theories and of communication theory. Do we really have anything deserving such grand titles? We may only be talking about eclectic collections of maxims and information "bits" about rhetoric and general communication. In any case, we won't know our state of affairs until we have made it a main order of business to correlate systematically what we know and what we dare to guess, to see whether these items do or don't form comprehensive ways of viewing spoken communication. And how else can we clearly identify the gaps in our conceptualizations and discover what further information about spoken communication we require? In this process of sketching and fleshing outlines of theory critics can, I believe, contribute by examining their own premises carefully, for to make any holistic judgment on the qualities and worths of an event involving speech every critic must have acted as if he understood the interplay of the forces studied. Let critics, then, accept the assignment suggested at New Orleans and both criticism and behavioral investigations are likely to be improved.

A second priority is expressed in recommendation 29 which encourages research that concentrates on understanding speech and response as on-going, interactive process. As Auer has pointed out, the historian as historian can only set out the context of spoken communication. This is not enough for our understanding. For any critic, as for any behavioral scientist, the question remains: What interactive processes occurred with what consequences within the neatly defined context? Because both critical and scientific knowledge have too long been stifled by considering "a speech" or "a message" as a thing, I applaud the Conference's wish that analysis of oral communication as process receive very high priority when we choose and design our research. I hope my fellow rhetorical critics will put their minds to this task as the New Orleans conferees promised to do.

Recommendation 30 calls for special attention in research to understanding the variables that define the inner natures of messages. From one point of view, this is a call for putting our scientific talent to work on speech criticism. Not only would that help me as a critic, but if the recommendation were taken as a general charge to our entire profession, it would become a salutary reminder to all of us that if we allow our interest in the contexts of speeches, dramas, and the like to minimize our attention to the speaking and responding, the playing and responding, we abandon the central problem that justifies our being associated together in the first place.

Calling in recommendation 31 for research that relates knowledge of speech-communication to knowledge developed in other areas of study, the conferees at New Orleans were thinking particularly of relating our knowledge to knowledge being developed in anthropology, psychology, sociology, and like subjects. As a rhetorical critic, I wish only to expand the vision a little. There are philosophical theories and concepts, literary theories and concepts, historiographical theories and concepts that can be refined if our knowledge of speech-communication is brought to bear on them-- and, of course, the reverse is true. Some of our critics have already accepted this objective in research; the increasingly fruitful interaction among rhetoricians and philosophers is a case in point and a proof of the wisdom of the recommendation coming from the New Orleans Conference.

Finally, when the conferees at New Orleans "encourage attempts to extend the generalizations from speech-communication research to pressing social and intercultural problems" I find their injunction just as needful among rhetorical critics as among those who apply the methods of the social sciences. Ever since I entered this profession, I have heard it alleged with only too much truth that historical-critical studies and experimental studies in our field frequently ask inconsequential questions and arrive at conclusions that enlighten no one. My valued former colleague, Herbert Wichelns, was prone to observe from time to time after reading one of our journals, "I hope you have read the new article on___________. One of our esteemed colleagues has discovered a speaker who had some ethos." Sadly, one did not need to know whether Wichelns had been reading an experimental or an historical-critical "research" paper. It could have been either.

I take our colleagues at New Orleans to be saying, among other things: "If research has little prospect of producing knowledge of some usefulness to someone in our time, it ought to be given low priority indeed." I take it they are not saying: "The only research of high priority is the 'hot problem' of this day and hour." They spent considerable time on recommendation 32. As I understood their discussion, the probable, long-haul value of information to be sought had first standing in their valuation of research problems, immediately after that came the probable usefulness of information in solving contemporary problems. I find no difficulty in adopting that kind of priority for rhetorical studies.

The call from our colleagues who met at New Orleans is one which I think we must accept if we are to make contributions to knowledge. It is one to which many of us, regardless of our methods of research, have been responding when we have worked at our best. But it seems to me one to which we can respond to more constructively than in the past if we focus as sharply as this

Conference did on what our central business is: to understand better the nature of spoken, symbolic interaction.

As a member of the Speech Association of America who had opportunity to listen in on this Conference from its beginning to its end, I want to offer a final observation. I do not understand the Conference's report to be one that tries to identify all of our professional concerns. I do understand it to say that, in our research and in our training of research specialists, we ought all to keep in mind that our common concern with understanding spoken, symbolic interaction makes us all scholars dependent on one another's teaching and discoveries, and that because this is true certain questions and goals in research ought to be preferred over others. As a member of this Association and as a rhetorical critic, I applaud the Conference for focusing attention on our common rather than on our disparate concerns and for recommending priorities in research that are likely to drive us toward fundamental rather than peripheral inquiries. I think we shall be wise to heed the Conference's implicit message, that the kinds of questions we ask in research are in the last analysis more important to our future than the procedures by which we seek answers.

Implications of the New Orleans Conference Recommendations From the Perspective of Behavioral Scholarship-- John Waite Bowers, University of Iowa.

When Mr. Poppendieck this morning expressed some concern about his place on the program, it reminded me of some research done some years ago by Halbert Gulley and David Berlo in which they tried to study variations in what they called intercellular and intracellular organization on the reception of a speech. I guess as far as intercellular organization is concerned, this part of the program is something of a climax in the sense that it has been referred to all day long and here it is. As far as my place on this part of the program is concerned, from an intracellular point of view, I guess this is an anti-climax in that I am a "B" following two "A's". Nevertheless, I think that an A-A-B organization is preferable to the reverse.

As some of you have heard, one of the continuing controversies in New Orleans concerned the answer to the question: What should we call our discipline? Some of us wanted to drop the pejorative "speech" and use the much cleaner "communication," under the reasonable assumption that modality is not a crucial discriminator for research, and maybe even for instructional purposes. One or two wanted speech colon communication. A larger faction advocated speech space communication. In the bitter end, a slight majority voted for the two nouns, "speech" and "communication" linked (or separated, depending on how you look at it) by a hyphen. (As Fred Williams said when the space vs. hyphen controversy got hot, "The world will never believe this.") Now, as I understand linguistic processes, this compound, speech hyphen communication, is something new in English and, even though it has the sanction of the New Orleans conference, it must still meet the test of any neologism. That is, it must still catch on to the point where lexicographers put it in dictionaries. I hope, therefore, that nobody will mind if in this short paper I show my recognition of the term's neologistic quality as well as my mild disapproval of it by pronouncing the hyphen. I will use a sound like this: ugh! I call that a straining grunt.

Since the planning committee deliberately loaded the New Orleans conference with behaviorists, the conference's message to other behaviorists is considerably more direct and less ambiguous than for historical and critical scholars. In fact, the drafting committee of which I was chairman made five specific recommendations, all of which were endorsed by the conference as a whole. I will review briefly those recommendations, amplifying those that need amplification by pointing to appropriate research. I think that all five taken together call for considerably more exploratory, analytic, and sophisticated research than most of us have been doing.

The first recommendation I will characterize with the word theory. We are encouraged "to undertake a program of formally defining the outlines of speech-communication theories." We are talking about theory in the sense of comprehensive sets of related generalizations leading to specific predictions, not in the sense of abstract speculation. I think that the recommendation promotes two kinds of research: 1). The kind where we take a large amount of research and fit it into some system that has a predictive potential. A good example from a related discipline is Thibaut and Kelley's now relatively old system of matrices in The Social Psychology of Groups. In our own field, Samuel Becker has a recent paper that he calls "Toward an Appropriate Theory for Contemporary Speech-Communication." I'm sure he'll be glad to send it on request. 2). The kind of research where a scholar takes mathematical or quasi-mathematical models, which may be more or less esoteric, asks the question, "How well does this work for communication phenomena?" and tries to answer it. Graph theory, game theory, and decision theory are three specimens that come to mind.

I call the second recommendation the interaction one. It says that we should do research emphasizing "the interactive, on-going, process nature of communication." I like a quotation from D. M. MacKay, who says that we might consider the individual (and, by analogy, the group) as "a vast constantly changing matrix of conditional probabilities . . . determining the relative probabilities of various patterns . . . of behavior in all possible circumstances." We recently had a good example of this kind of research at the University of Iowa. Dennis Gouran, now of Indiana University, did a dissertation in which he related 8 characteristics of discussion statements (opinionatedness, orientation, etc.) to the same characteristics in succeeding statements and to consensus in small-group problem-solving discussion. I understand that Thomas Scheidel at the University of Illinois is also working with probabilities of kinds of consecutive statements in group discussion. This research is stimulating: it opens wide areas of exploration. We have already had another study related to Gouran's in which one of our graduate students, John Kline, took the "opinionatedness" characteristic and tried to find indices for it more objective than the ratings of judges. Our research must become more molecular. It must apply stochastic models, but it must apply them to data much more refined than the gross groups we are now accustomed to working with.

Methodology is the term characterizing the third recommendation. The conference "encourages methodological research designed to produce more precise definition of independent and dependent variables, particularly message variables." As I see the recommendation, it officially encourages studies using sensibly controlled, operationally defined, analysis and synthesis of content and style. In our amplification of the recommendation, we also specified the high priority that should be given to studies intended to measure more precisely message effects. Again, as in the second recommendation, we are seeking molecular analysis, precision work. A few examples come to mind. My own work with the definition of language intensity, though that definition is still awkward and unwieldy, would have fit the recommendation, I think, if it had come after instead of before the conference. Miller and Hewgill's careful work with fear-arousing appeals is an example, again with a qualification: As the conference noted, "to study the effects of anxiety-arousing messages, the communication scholar should be able to specify more precisely than at present the anxiety-arousing potential of various messages for various receivers." In short, we at the conference recognized our need to specify much more reliably the differences in messages that make differences in communication. At least in my judgment, this quest will lead to many dead ends, for many differences in messages probably don't make much difference in communication. Still, the conference encourages us to work on it.

The fourth recommendation is the interdisciplinary one. We are encouraged to do research "relating speech-communication theories and research to the theories and research of related disciplines." At the conference, many examples were suggested, but we could settle on no list to put in the official document because any list excluded so many disciplines equally as relevant as those included. A few obvious areas of interest for us are linguistics, psychology, history, political science, and sociology. Our interest in communication intersects with the interests of many other scholars. (I think Aristotle said something like that.) Fred Williams characterized the nature of this recommendation in a sentence. He said at the conference, "I'd like to know, for example, how the details of language enter into the details of communication."

The final recommendation I call the distress, or maybe distress-relief recommendation. It calls for the social application of what we know and what we learn: "Although this conference stresses the need for basic research, it encourages attempts to extend the generalizations from speech-communication research to pressing social problems." Insofar as "pressing social problems" are consequences of malfunctions in communication, we have, or should have, some partial remedies to them. The sights and sounds of marching feet instead of articulate voices seeking redress of grievances probably should make us much more uncomfortable, as specialists in communication, than they do. The conference, by this recommendation, encourages all of us some of the time and some of us all of the time to be social engineers, I think.

Those are the recommendations. Now I must apologize for something before somebody else notices it. If you take the initial letters of my five characterizing terms-- theory, interaction, methodology, interdisciplinary, and distress-- you will notice that the acronym is TIMID. It just worked out that way. It really did. The acronym does not indicate my evaluation of the recommendations. In fact, upon reflection, I don't know how we could have made better ones. I now endorse even the one I opposed in New Orleans, the distress one. I think that our vision was good. May it be fulfilled.

Questions for the Panel

Q: Our panelists have established the fact that they agree with the New Orleans recommendations. My question, however, is whether or not-- and if so, in what ways-- will agreeing with the recommendations really change the behavior and scholarship of the panelists and the kinds of persons whom they represent?

Auer: There seems to be an implication, which I take exception to in this question that the historical scholar in the past has had no concern with other approaches to scholarship. For myself, when I have been involved in applying the historical method, I have been not a little bit curious about finding other ways of making more valid-- or seemingly more valid-- the conclusions that I would reach by the traditional historical method. To an extent, therefore, in pursuing historical studies, I would propose to continue to make use of resources from other methodologies. I think that it would be fair to say that my sophistication in doing so will be augmented as a result of the New Orleans Conference. I should add that in this I speak for myself. There are, of course, limitations in the data available when one is working on, for example, the campaign of 1868. But I think that all of us feel that conclusions are stronger when several different methods of analysis can be employed.

Arnold: The question is not whether these recommendations are a complete blueprint for my work. They certainly are not. My point is that unless my colleagues, who can do certain things that I cannot do, have the kind of thrust implied by the New Orleans Conference, I shall be incapacitated. Since I am not a scientist, and since I cannot test my hypotheses with the kind of scientific rigor that John Bowers was talking about, unless I have help from other people-- from people who are also interested in spoken, symbolic interaction-- I will not grow in my efforts. I cannot grow professionally unless my profession adopts this thrust-- not to the exclusion of others-- but in concert with the others.

Bowers: One should observe that the recommendations of the New Orleans Conference are not completely new. Obviously, those recommendations went to New Orleans in the minds of some of the participants. I do think, however, that the recommendations call attention to and encourage innovations which have a good bit of newness about them. For example, more and more at conventions and among our own graduate students, I see more and more attempts to apply contemporary communication theory to communication problems of the past. To me, this is a very encouraging thing. There is value in historical studies in taking contemporary theory-- theory based on empirical studies-- and attempting to project backwards from that theory. This checks the adequacy of the theory in relation to historical problems. It seems to me that this is the kind of thing that the recommendations ask for and, although they are not entirely new, they should encourage a movement that is getting underway and that appears to have a great deal of potential.

Q: This question is for John Bowers. What sort of intellectual sustenance does a researcher of your persuasion get from the historian and/or the critic?

Bowers: I am not certain that I am the right person to answer this question, but I feel that some of my own best work has been done in collusion with other kinds of researchers.

To be specific, I think that one of my best pieces of research was the piece on metaphor that I did in collaboration with Michael Osborn; his approach is almost entirely that of the historian-critic.

Arnold: And that particular piece of research makes one of the most pointed observations about rhetorical theory that I have ever encountered.

Q: It would be my assumption that if the recommendations of the New Orleans conference are carried out, a scholar 100 years from now who is attempting to research the campaign of 1968 would be in a substantially better position than the scholar of today who is attempting to research the campaign of 1868. Is this a reasonable surmise?

Auer: A hundred years from now, a student of the history of our field will also express some surprise that these issues were ever regarded as controversial.

Q: Might it not be profitable to consider the application of perhaps three different research approaches to a particular communication problem-- that of speech for the disadvantaged, for example? This might be an area in which three different kinds of interests might converge.

Arnold: One of the significant things that happened in New Orleans, it seems to me, is that, after the first day and a half or so, the conferees passed the point where they were asking what a specific method would accomplish. They reached a point, which I think is a fundamental one in all research, and that is to ask the question of the researcher, "What is your problem?" When you can really identify a problem or a question, then it seems to me that you apply any and all methodologies that hold promise. It seems to me that in most areas of research in our field we are just reaching that point where we are ceasing to look for a question to which we can apply a particular method, and are, instead, starting with a question and then making judgments about appropriate methodologies. A careful articulation of the question-- whether in studies of the disadvantaged or in any other area-- should lead to the selection of appropriate methods.

SMALL GROUP REPORTS

James McBath, University of Southern California, reporting for the Historical Studies group.

The historical group concerned itself with the meaning of the New Orleans recommendations, and with our interpretation of the way in which historically-oriented scholars can live with such recommendations. Our conclusions, very briefly, were as follows. One of the first questions that was raised asked whether the recommendations imply a break with the past. Do the recommendations imply an emphasis on contemporary problems, a focus on visible data of the present, a shift in the emphases or historical locale of research? We decided that they did not--that there was nothing in the recommendations with which we could not comfortably live. We decided that an exclusive focus on contemporary issues was not intended, but rather the recommendations imply different ways of dealing with and looking at historic problems-- probably from a contemporary stance. Secondly, we decided that some issues become historically more important when related to the contemporary dialogue. We concurred that the methods of the scientists could be used appropriately for some types of historical research, and we decided that critical scholars can learn from the cumulative thrust of the behavioral scholars, just as their hypotheses are frequently derived from historical data.

-- In terms of the overall thrust of the New Orleans Conference, we felt that the meaning was perhaps stated in these words: Can the house of speech accommodate these views? We viewed these views as a set of ideas, with these scholars asking if we could live with them, rather than as a credo to which our profession should now subscribe. We felt that future conferences dealing with historical-critical issues can add new dimensions to the New Orleans recommendations from which a new composite rationale could be developed. We viewed the New Orleans recommendations as a very important, valuable position paper. We decided that we were not dealing with academic priorities but rather with scholarly relationships.

-- Finally, a little bit of our discussion was concerned with the title, "speech-communication." We came up with no resolution of this craggy problem; we suggested continued study of the name; we decided that if the name were changed, it wouldn't indicate a change in emphases or relationships or priorities. Perhaps the matter should be studied from a pragmatic point of view, since communication is being considered in so many contexts on the campus. Many of us are being asked what we in speech are doing in this realm of communication. Our group felt that, following additional study, some accommodation in the direction of the recommended name change would probably prove helpful.

Edwin Black, University of Wisconsin, reporting for the Critical Studies group.

Being properly critical, the critical group came to no conclusions. I can only report a kind of benign disquiet of spirit that manifested itself in our discussions. This disquiet can perhaps be summarized in three points that seemed to crystallize. The first is that the concept of what constitutes the education of a professional, as Carroll Arnold put it, is still not sufficiently clear from the New Orleans document. This subject, we felt, merits further attention. Secondly, there was expressed in the course of our discussion, some misgiving about the aportioning of time allotted the study of rhetoric in graduate education in the New Orleans report. There was considerable disagreement on this issue. Finally, there was expressed, more than once, considerable exaltation in the efforts that this kind of enterprise seem to exhibit-- efforts at reconciliation-- efforts to achieve an intellectual homogeneity from enterprises that have heretofore been fragmented. Some note was taken in our discussion of the fact that, in the past, some areas formerly associated with the SAA have broken away seemingly because there had been insufficient focus on matters of common interest and concern. The New Orleans conference, at last, gives promise of a candid confrontation relative to the common elements shared by persons performing different tasks. In that way, the report may well serve to inhibit further fragmentation.

John Waite Bowers, University of Iowa, reporting for the Behavioral Studies group.

Our group began with a discussion of the storage of data and information retrieval, which discussion I will not report here. Jack Matthews then asked two questions which gave focus to the remainder of the discussion. These questions were: 1). How can we go about implementing the New Orleans recommendations for the present generation and future generations of scholars?; and 2). What would be the chief resistance encountered in such efforts? As you might expect, the responses to these two questions were quite varied. There was particular reaction to Recommendation 40-- which specifies the program for the first year of graduate study. As one person put it, this recommendation is likely to encounter "dissonant interaction." There seemed to be a general consensus that, even though it is ambitious, the recommendation does offer a practical curriculum for the first year of generalized study which would be followed by specialization.

-- We then discussed several schisms or conflicts within our profession. One of these is the seeming conflict in our field between our notions of performance and content in our courses. There seemed to be a consensus that performance and content are not mutually exclusive. A second conflict revolved around the question of whether the New Orleans participants regarded themselves as scientists or rhetoricians. The orientation of the conference and its participants was in the direction of the scientific study of communication. The recommendations are directly applicable to the production of that kind of scholar and scholarship. However, we also agreed that most of the recommendations are generalizable to many of the other areas represented in the Speech Association of America. The third area of schism revolved around the terms "speech," "communication," and "speech communication." We heard a number of testimonials from people at various institutions about the beneficial effects of name changes involving "communication." We heard very little testimony in favor of retaining the name "speech." Stan Paulson suggested that it would be worthwhile for SAA to undertake to find out just where, among the departments around the country, we do stand on this name business. Such a study should also include the names of divisions within departments. There was some discussion of the motives that impel persons to cling to one designation or another, but I do not believe that it would be particularly profitable to review that discussion here.

Sunday, July 14

Reports of Research and Instructional Development Projects in Progress

James W. Gibson, University of Missouri, A Survey of the Beginning Speech Course in Colleges and Universities.

This will be a brief interim report; the findings of the study will be presented in greater detail at the December convention. This is an SAA-sponsored study; specifically, it has been carried out under the aegis of the Undergraduate Speech Instruction Interest Group. Questionnaires were distributed to all of the schools that are listed in the SAA DIRECTORY that have departments of speech or that offer courses in speech. We have received some 380 completed questionnaires representing, I think, most of the major institutions in the country. We will distribute a follow-up to the institutions not responding by September 1. This should permit us to give a near-final report in December.

-- I will try to give you a generalized indication of the kinds of responses that we have been receiving. Although many of these responses are what one might anticipate, there have been some interesting deviations. For the purposes of this study, we are dealing with the course which is the basic required course-- or which would be designated by the department as the required course if such a course were wanted by the institution or any of its divisions. We find that this course is generally a three-semester-hour course enrolling students at the freshman level. I was a little surprised at how few institutions enrol students in the basic course at the sophomore level. Contrary to what one might expect, the basic philosophy of the course tends to be first in the fundamentals area and secondly in the public speaking area. We have had a number of responses indicating that outside lecturers are brought in for purposes of consultation. One might expect such consultants to come from such fields as English and history. We have been surprised at the number who come from business and psychology.

- Most of the institutions reporting do not use mass television lecturers; where such lecturers are used, in most instances, they are recorded locally. The predominant mode of instruction reported involves lectures and student speeches. There is some indication that respondents are reporting what they think they ought to be doing rather than what they actually are doing.
- The typical kinds of activities in the basic course that one would expect to be reported have indeed been reported--informative speeches, persuasive speeches, et al. In the area of listening, 50% of the institutions reporting indicated that they give a significant amount of time for a unit on listening in the basic course. It surprised me somewhat to learn that more time is frequently given to listening than to, for example, motivation or reasoning.
- Our responses indicate that most of the instruction in the basic course is not carried out by graduate students; this reflects, of course,the fact that many smaller institutions are represented in our study. Most of the instruction is provided by full-time staff members from the areas of public address and theatre; from approximately 76% to 100% of the full-time faculty teach in the basic course. This seems to be a higher figure than most of us would have expected. Approximately 25% of the full-time faculty teaching load is devoted to the basic course. The course is generally directed by an assistant professor in public address, and most of the staff at the present time does not feel that the basic course is in need of any revision whatsoever. Respondents appear to be quite satisfied that their basic courses-- taught from the fundamentals and public speaking point of view--are generally quite satisfactory. I suspect that the final figures that we report in December will reveal some differences in the various categories from the data that I have reported today. I suspect that you share some of my suspicions about apparent inferences that can be drawn from this interim data.

Raymond C. Beaty, Ohio University, An Interdisciplinary Investigation of Approaches to Language Style in the Twentieth Century.

This research is a dissertation project at Ohio University directed by Dr. Paul Boase, entitled, "Theoretical Constructs of Language Style." The study began a little over 2 years ago after the completion of a first-year graduate program following the prescription of the New Orleans Conference recommendation No. 40. It would be fair to say that the study was undertaken because such a graduate program had been pursued. A need for more information about language style in interpersonal communication was recognized. The study reflects a general dissatisfaction with the manner in which language style is dealt with in present scholarship and in present textbooks.

-- The first phase of the study involved an interdisciplinary collection of approaches to language style in the 20th century. The literature of the various areas of interpersonal communication was explored in order to determine what the various approaches have been in our discipline during this period. Secondly, the literature of other disciplines was investigated to determine what information from these areas we might well use. Included in the latter were the areas of literary criticism, structural and computational linguistics, translation theory, psychology-- particularly abnormal and clinical psychology-- psycholinguistics, language statistics, historiography, philosophy-- primarily esthetics and semantics-- and acoustics. The investigation quickly revealed the diversity of concepts that do exist. These concepts ranged from style as an observable characteristic to linguistic characteristics, to style as something beyond the linguistic unit. Throughout the disciplines, there is a seeming lack of any attempt to synthesize the various approaches. This collection of material provided the data for the central part of the investigation which was to analyze and synthesize the various concepts and approaches, deciding what factors could be used in arriving at an understanding of language usage in interpersonal communication.

-- Finally, the relevance of considering both the structural and semantic variables of all of the different levels of language-- phonological, morphological, syntactical, lexical-- was outlined with reference to our concerns with language in communication.

Jack Douglas, Ohio State University, A Factor Analysis of the Dimensions of Political Images.

The study that I am going to report here is part of a group of studies designed to develop tests and refine perceptual theory of human communication. In order to get at the major variables with greater precision and comprehensiveness than we have been able to do, it is necessay to develop measuring instruments. The factor analysis involved here is part of the process of developing such an instrument. The purpose of this study is to determine the perceived dimensions in the images of political candidates on the part of a college population. The procedure was to create a preliminary measure to test political images. We came up with 148 scales for an IBM sheet that has a capacity for 150. We divided these into pairs, so we ended up with two forms-- the odds and the evens. We collected our scales from wherever we could get them-- from previous studies, Osgood, et al. But we changed Osgood's 7-point scale to a 4-point scale-- the bipolar adjectives "fair" and "unfair" and "both" and "neither." We scored it by a direction of polarity that works from left to right and by magnitude of polarity-- neither counting zero, both counting one, and either of the adjectives counting two. With two scorings on two sets of items we had four sets of data upon which to perform the factor analysis. We could see if we arrived at the same factors with each of these four measures. The polarity of scales, of course, was randomized. The stimulus figures used were Lyndon Johnson, Robert Kennedy, Nelson Rockefeller, and Richard Nixon. Over 400 subjects in the basic Speech 105 course at Ohio State University were used. There were over 800 individual tests. These were scored and punched and there was no existing program accommodating this number of variables, so I sought outside assistance in devising a suitable program. We also plan a correlation matrix to perform a cluster analysis in order to check against what we got in the factor analyses. Then we used Dr. Wherry's hierarchical analysis. This much has been done. I got the materials out of the computer on Friday, and while the rest of you have been having fun, I have been trying to make sense out of about 40 sheets of data. We will compare the results of these four, as I have suggested, put all four together, and then we will use the Wherry-Winer analysis-- another factor analysis program for large numbers. This will throw all 296 variables together. This requires specifying the factors which we will do on the basis of the hierarchical analysis, and then we will check every item against each factor. This will result, we hope, in a measuring instrument in which each item has the highest possible loading on one factor and the lowest possible loading on all other factors. The product of such an instrument would be a profile of the dimensions of each figure's image. The test might then be used to study such things as the relation of the image to such factors as the ability to predict voting behavior, the influence of the image on the perception of the message from that source, changes in the image that occur as the result of events such as assassinations and withdrawals from candidacy, or the effect of campaigns on images or changes of media, the effect of dissonance in the image, et al. These are some of the possible uses to which such an instrument might be put.

-- A similar procedure will be used to develop a measure of perceived dimensions of issues, of perceived meanings in political messages, of perceived meanings in contemporary poetry, perceived dimensions of communicative situations. What are the dimensions in which situation is actually perceived by the participant under various conditions? The dimension of self-image and its relation to the image of the other in a communication dyad can be studied. When such measures are developed, they may be used to study the interaction of the perceived external factor-- situation, source, and message with internal cognitive and affective factors-- self-esteem, dogmatism, ego-involvement, etc. One study that we plan to do is an election study in which we will attempt to predict the reception of a political message on the basis of the interaction of the perceived image of the source and the perceived dimensions of the issues. So we have, then, four-factor analyses-- one produced 5 primary factors, one produced 6, and one produced 7. And two of these produced two second-order factors and one third-order factor-- factors out of factors. The conclusions that we have reached at this point are none. Unsupported research has its compensations-- the fun of doing your own "thing"-- being able to react with the data-- to restructure when you wish-- to follow more fruitful leads-- not having to know exactly what you are expected to find before you start looking for it. The time saved by not having to pursue grant money and in not having to carry out the administrative and reporting requirements of the grant can be used for research. And perhaps we can get more understanding of the variables if we study them before defining them wholly and rigorously; perhaps we can thereby come to a fuller understanding of them. At least, it makes a beautiful rationalization.

Dwight L. Freshley, University of Georgia, Improvements in Listening in a Creative Dramatics-Speech Improvement Program.

The program that I am going to describe is in keeping with Jeff Auer's injunction, quoted in the June issue of Spectra, about our need to concentrate more on speech improvement. The study is part of the Hancock County Speech Improvement Program in Georgia. This is a rural county in central Georgia that has the highest proportion of Negroes in the entire State. Approximately two-thirds of the county residents are Negro. About two years ago, a native of Hancock County who had left the area, returned as coordinator of Federal projects. Various programs involving government support were instituted. Interest was expressed in a speech improvement program. Last year, a full-time project director was hired-- a lady with a drama background-- and she was given three graduate students as assistants. The program had a number of objectives, of which at least three could be tested. The first was to improve articulation and pronunciation; to increase the speech repertory-- to replace impoverished vocabularies with more comprehensive ones; and to improve listening ability and comprehension. I was particularly interested in the last-named, and I concentrated particularly on children in the 5th grade. I sought to test the following hypothesis: children exposed to a systematic training program of speech improvement which concentrated on articulation and pronunciation and a creative dramatics program which encourages freedom of expression and listening would gain significantly in their scores on the STEP Listening Test over students not enrolled in the program. The mean score on the 80-item STEP Listening Test for the white population at the 5th grade level was 47. The national average is 52. The Negro population scored 29.5. Using "t" tests of significance, we found, to cite one example, that over one half of the Negro population in one school improved their position on the percentile ratings by 100%. That is, if they were in the second percentile, they went to fourth; if they were in the tenth percentile, they went to the twentieth. The data to which I have referred was collected in the fall, and we have not as yet analyzed the data collected in the spring. There will be a follow-up program next year. Even though there will apparently be cutbacks in Federal support, the initial value of the speech improvement program has been demonstrated to the point where continuing support by the Hancock County system appears, at least for the time, assured.

NOTE: Professor Kim Giffin, University of Kansas, was originally scheduled to report, but was unable to attend the conference. He had submitted abstracts relating to research in the following 3 areas: 1). Behavioral Changes in the Aged Through Remotivation; 2). Recent Research on Speech Anxiety; and 3). Recent Research on Interpersonal Trust.

Alvin Goldberg, University of Denver, An Experimental Study of the Acquisition of Behavioral Principles by Videotape Self-Confrontation.

This last March, Dr. Daniel Boone and I received a $52,000 grant from the U. S. Office of Education to study the effectiveness of videotape self-confrontation in training-- in training both communication specialists in human relations training, and also in the training of specialists in communication disorders. We are attempting to develop feasible videotape self-confrontation methods. At a theoretical level, we are concerned about feedback processes and we are also looking into the effectiveness of operant conditioning approaches in this kind of setting. The first phase is the development of the methodology. We have one condition that consists of a single confrontation where individuals are given an opportunity to observe themselves and then we have a double confrontation condition wherein some of our subjects will observe themselves observing themselves. Once we have the methods developed, we are going to test the effects experimentally. We will measure the effects of self-confrontation on such things as self-concept. We expect to use a variety of instruments in accomplishing this. We also have a couple of side-projects going that will involve use of the videotape machinery. One seeks to analyze conflict in group situations, and we are also now studying the effects of self-confrontation on the expression of feeling. In this latter, we are again using an operant conditioning approach to determine the effects of certain kinds of responses to what we see on videotape on subsequent behavior when it comes to the expression of personal feelings, attitudes, and beliefs.

Robert B. Hawkins, Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville, Progress Report on Two Experimental Studies in Instructional Development.

One of two areas of interest that I have been developing over the past couple of years is an interest in the relationship between openness, trust, and acceptance to personal effectiveness in speaking. Specifically, I have developed two questions with respect to this area: 1) What is the relationship between self-trust, self-acceptance, openness with oneself, and increased personal effectiveness as a speaker; and 2) What is the relationship between one's estimate of the trust that others have in him and his personal effectiveness as a speaker? The study bears a relationship to the one that Al Goldberg has just reported on.

-- The second area of investigation has to do with television playbacks in teaching speech to disadvantaged college youth. A good deal of work has been done in using playbacks with elementary and secondary school youngsters-- white and black-- advantaged and disadvantaged-- but to the best of my knowledge not very much work has been done in this area with college-age disadvantaged youth. The questions that I am seeking to answer are these: 1). Can the strength of students' self-concepts be accurately measured with semantic differential scales? 2). What is the relationship between students' self-concepts and their estimates of classmates' concepts of them, their estimates of classmates' self-concepts, and their grades? 3). Does use of the playbacks improve instruction and also sharpen students' perceptions of themselves and their classmates? 4). To what extent can variations in answers to the above questions be attributed to socio-economic-cultural differences among the subjects? The procedures for these studies have involved the use on a before-after basis of video-playbacks, speech performance tests, written tests, and semantic differential scales.

The subjects are undergraduate speech students drawn from the Edwardsville campus of Southern Illinois University and from an experimental college for the culturally and economically disadvantaged. The experimental college is located in East St. Louis. The college is sponsored by SIU and is being supported by a government grant.

-- Some of my findings to date follow. The students on the Edwardsville campus-- I call them the advantaged students-- seem to be more accurate, more precise in placing themselves on the semantic differential scales. They seem to take longer in "pegging" themselves on the scales, and they seem to avoid pegging themselves at the positive extremes. The East St. Louis students tend to be extreme-- in rating themselves they tend to be extremely optimistic or extremely pessimistic. It's hard to find a pattern among these East St. Louis students. Their self-concepts about speaking ability do not correlate well with the speech instructor's estimates. In viewing the playbacks, the Edwardsville students seem to accept the experience; they can confront themselves without too much difficulty. With the East St. Louis students, there is a less sophisticated response, especially among those who are academically least able. I have concluded that the scales that we are using could benefit by some revision. For example, "cool" and "straight" might be preferable to "gracious" and "crude." In time, I expect to have some additional suggestions about these measurement instruments.

Hugo Hellman, Marquette University, To "Cool It" on the Campus in '68-'69.

This is not a research report. The program that I am going to describe represents a response on the part of the Marquette University School of Speech to recent campus developments. My personal interest in this general area of dissent and disorder on the campus has been augmented by the fact that I have a son who is a graduate student at Columbia University and a daughter who has just married a student at the Sorbonne.

-- It might be helpful if I explain how the situation at Marquette was recently brought strikingly home to us. On May 20, we had our annual dinner given by the President for the faculty in honor of outstanding faculty. The dinner was held in our Union and when I tried to get in there was a four-deep line of pickets, many of them my own students. I was able to get through, but not without being physically pushed. The dinner was disrupted by noise, and when we tried to get out, they were again packed four-deep outside the door. The kinds of actions that are being taken today come as a shock to me in a context where we are trying to teach different kinds of democratic action.

- Four years ago, we revised our basic course from public speaking to what we call Speaking in Groups. We began to introduce discussion, debate, and organized group procedures. The activist group at Marquette has certainly followed procedures that are the antithesis of what we have been teaching. If this is the way in which student leaders propose to act, I can't see very much relevance in what we are trying to teach. Arguments are presented on picket signs, persuasion is by marching and demonstrations, and pickets, and all of the action is outside of the due process of student government. We have a student senate whose members are duly elected.
- One of the things that we are going to do in the fall is to bend all of the assignments in the basic course in the direction of making the discussion activities that are taught relevant to the campus situation. We are going to use debating in the course and bend it toward these campus problems. In the teaching of the organized group procedures-- parliamentary procedure, action in organized meetings-- we are going to make a concerted effort to supply to organized student government the means for increasing the power of the student senate. In addition, this fall, at least one half of the resources of our debate program-- financial, faculty, and student resources-- are going to be devoted to issues arising on the campus. The debaters are going to debate publicly the issues that arise, and the debaters are going to issue challenges to groups that are making demands. Through our basic speech course, then, we will reach some 1200 sophomores, and we will attempt to reach a broader public through debates.

Paul Hunsinger, University of Denver, A Research and Training Program in Communication for the Laity.

I want to talk briefly about the research training program that we presently have in operation and I also want to say a few words about how we obtained the supporting grant. This is a research program in how to improve the communication of the laity. We are not interested in the formal means of communication. The program starts with sensitivity training in a "retreat" situation. This sensitivity training, which will take place in a relatively isolated spot in the mountains, will be a prelude to a 10-day training program that will be held on the campus. On the campus, we will give them instant homiletics in terms of videotape experiences, and we will be dealing with the organizational communication programs that the laity face today. Very little research has been done on this. Here are people who have something to say but who have considerable difficulty in breaking through the structures to get their message across to local congregations or to the denomination because of the rigid, professionally-controlled and oriented communication pattern. The program at the University of Denver is a pilot program, and we plan to bring in certain people whom we will record on tape and film for use in "satellite" programs. One of the persons whom we are bringing in is Mark Gibbs, author of the book, "God's Frozen People." He is probably the outstanding authority on communication problems among the laity in England.

-- If you want a more complete report, we will be glad to send you a copy of the report that we submit to the people at the Lilly Foundation. And what a difference there is between drawing up a proposal for the government and drawing one up for a private foundation. I do not mean to suggest that it is easier to get money from private sources. Our first step was to draw up a very complete outline of what we wanted to do. At that time, we were concerned with communication training of the clergy. We soon abandoned that approach, because there were so many training programs for the clergy throughout the country. So we turned to the communication problems of the layman. We looked through the Grant Data Quarterly and found that the Lilly Foundation seemed to be interested in this kind of research. I talked with a man who had, during his lifetime secured some $10 million from the Lilly Foundation in an effort to capitalize on his experience. We did a considerable amount of research on the persons whom we would be approaching. I wrote a letter to the Foundation and indicated that I would be in Indianapolis and would welcome an opportunity to discuss our proposal. Until advised otherwise, I had been prepared with something of a Madison Avenue approach. I was advised to relax and be myself-- simple, old Paul Hunsinger, ex-preacher. So I went in and chatted with them very informally, picked up some ideas of their interests, and nothing happened. In the spring, they said they would like to come out and talk with me some more. They came out and we talked and, once again, I was prepared for a Madison Avenue-type pitch. They asked me simply to give them a two-page outline of what we wanted to do-- including budget. I asked for $37,650. About two weeks after their visit, Charles Williams called up and said that the Foundation was going to make the grant, but that I had made a mistake. I hadn't asked for enough money. They informed me that they were going to give us $42,000. A week later, a check in that amount arrived by regular mail. All they ask now is that occasionally we let them know what is

> going on. They are fine people to work with. The personalities of the people involved-- both the petitioners and granters-- are very important. Al Goldberg and I were among the "have-nots" last year at this conference; with almost $100,000 between us from both government and private sources, we place ourselves among the "haves" this year. We attribute a sizable proportion of this change in affairs to our attendance here last summer.

William Howell, University of Minnesota, Research Projects in Intercultural Speech-Communication.

I want to begin by making some statements that constitute a possible rationale for intercultural communication research and curriculum development in departments of speech-communication. John Bystrom gave me several quotable quotes yesterday. He alluded to the new mathematics as resulting from a coordinated, large-scale, long-term effort and indicated that the speech communication field should be amenable to similar efforts. He called attention to the potential which organizations like SAA have in such efforts. I am very much concerned that the SAA consider giving greater emphasis to intercultural communication. Another provocative observation was that our curriculum and content in speech-communication are supremely culture-bound and, like all of our liberal education, is badly in need of relief on this front. Another assertion was that research in speech-communication is intrinsically interdepartmental. No one department has adequate resources to approach the tasks involved in research in communication. John Bystrom also mentioned that interdisciplinary efforts appear to be the way of the future, and certainly intercultural communication lends itself very nicely to such approaches. He also mentioned that applied research seems to get support. The application of any knowledge turned up-- particularly knowledge about communication between North American and other cultures-- appears to be in line for support. It seems to me that the speech-communication discipline is the logical planning and coordinating agency for intercultural speech-communication research. I think that our claim to existence in the academic world rests on a very simple fact-- more than anybody else, we in speech-communication have spent our time and energy on spoken interaction. We do have a certain claim to expertness in this area. I have tried this on some of my colleagues at the Campus Club, and I have been quite surprised at their willingness to accept this generalization. If we do indeed have an interdisciplinary attack on problems of intercultural communication, some department is going to be entrusted with the responsibility for planning and administering this kind of research. Our departments are the logical ones to assume such responsibilities, and that is not a bad spot to be in.

-- Let me mention briefly the Minnesota Projects that are underway. For many years, I have been involved in studying international propaganda broadcasts, but I have turned during the last few years, as has our Department, to interpersonal studies. In 1965, I did a survey of North Americans working overseas in American corporations. By tape recording interviews with native managers, and American managers who work together, I got an analysis of their communication problems in working together. This led to some hypotheses, a major hypothesis being-- as a sample illustration-- that what would make you a great success in communicating internationally or interculturally in Tokyo would kill you in Bombay. We established some hypotheses and set up an interdepartmental project involving anthropology, sociology, and speech. We had teams of graduate students-- boy-girl teams from those three areas-- involving three contrasting cultures-- Tokyo, Beirut, and Bogota. They spent 90 days training for this and developing instruments and then they spent 90 days overseas, and another quarter back home interpreting results. It was a truly interesting interdepartmental enterprise. We studied 5 things: proxemic, kinesic, personality, linguistic, and culture variables which affect the communication between North Americans and nationals working together in business and education.

-- I have presently started on a somewhat different kind of project-- a study of the effects of membership in religious and ethnic groups on informal communication in Hawaii. Hawaii is an ideal laboratory for this kind of study, because the ethnic groups have retained their identity in every way and they all speak excellent English. This means that the language barrier is not quite as prominent as it is in most places. As the Vice-President of the East-West Center has put it, there is no busier interaction among cultures than in Hawaii.

-- We have piled up a good bit of material from which there have been some curricular by-products. We have two new courses, one of which we are teaching this summer for the first time called Intercultural Speech-Communication. It is a senior college, graduate-level course that seems to interest a wide variety of persons interested in cross-cultural communication. It benefits from an abundance of guest lecturers who are willing to come in from other departments. I also have a graduate seminar in Face-to-Face Intercultural Communication. Another thing that we have done in the Department is to establish a non-verbal communication laboratory. It is equipped with a camera in the ceiling, a one-way mirror, and that sort of thing so that we can bring people from different cultures together and study their non-verbal reactions. Some of the rather glib pronouncements of the anthropologists relative to intercultural communication are being questioned.

-- My work with persons from sociology and anthropology has taught me several things. In working with them, I have passed through several stages: euphoria-- characterized by an "everything we have is yours" attitude; the second phase is one of skepticism and withdrawal-- the graduate students from the other departments found, in relation to their job-seeking after the conclusion of the project, that they had been "contaminated"; and a third stage, the one in which we find ourselves now, wherein we have a more restricted kind of cooperation. The main difference is that when a graduate student comes to us now from another department, he will be more rigorously supervised during the project to make certain that he does not pick up that which could be regarded as contamination. Interestingly enough, the contamination was not so much from speech-communication, but rather from anthropology to sociology and from sociology to anthropology. These, then, are some of the stages that you may confront, if you embark on interdepartmental projects.

John W. Keltner, Oregon State University, Speech Communication in Structured and Unstructured Task Replication Systems.

This is a small, funded project that started informally back in 1952 at the Southwestern Regional Laboratory in Human Relations where we were using a demonstration of organizational communication, one involving the use of a cubicle and the passing back and forth of bits of paper for transmitting information. We had not found a useful face-to-face communication instrument for measuring the structural characteristics and the effects of structure on communication-- except for one. We constructed a model from some toy cards designed by Charles Ames which we put behind a screen, then we allowed various degrees of information to emanate from behind the screen to a duplicate set of constructing materials by a team. As one example, we had the standard organized system where only the manager could see the model and he must then direct information to the foreman, who must then force information down to the workers, and the workers are the only ones who can touch the cards and attempt the replication. We have presented this demonstration both educationally and entertainingly about 400 times. We have gone back over our records, and in all of the demonstrations that we have made, we have used at least two types of structure. One is the formal structure where one person sees the model, then must pass that information down so that the others may replicate the model; the other involves, in effect, telling the group to do anything they want to. Such groups create their own structure-- and it is usually an open structure-- and, with but one exception, the open group has always won the race. That is to say, they finished the job sooner and with fewer errors. Management personnel find it hard to believe in the validity of these findings. Out of this background, we decided to bring the study into the laboratory, conduct some very carefully controlled tests-- with videotape analysis and with observer analysis-- of behaviors under various sets of conditions-- including the formal structure at one end and the completely open structure at the other. This centers around an apparently simple task of putting some cards together in a structure. It becomes difficult, however, just to handle the amount of information that must go down those channels. The actual control of information that goes up and down human channels in face-to-face talk is a matter with which we are greatly concerned.

-- We have used this particular analysis to set up a program which the school has funded-- with a very small amount of money, to provide us with some help from the computer center. We have also used this same model and will be experimenting with it in our basic course which, like others described here, is no longer in public speaking, but is rather a course in face-to-face, interpersonal communication. Our whole thrust is in the direction of trying to find out what effects face-to-face talk has on information, and what effects that information which is passed on through face-to-face talk has on the behavior of those who receive it and pass it down.

James C. McCroskey, Michigan State University, The Use of Television Playback as an Instructional Aid in Public Speaking Classes.

This is a project that Brad Lashbrook and I have been conducting during this past year. It has been supported by the Michigan State University Educational Development Program. It is not easy to get funds from that program-- even when your contact man is John Dietrich. Our interest in instructional television is as a teaching aid rather than as a teaching substitute. Neither of us is particularly enamored of the way in which instructional television is currently being used in the speech field. We are trying to find out whether television can improve instruction rather than being merely non-significantly different. We have tried to design a study in which it was necessary to reject the null hypothesis in order to make television a feasible feature to add to the course. If our research is sloppy, we will not be adding any more television. The independent variables which we studied were: self-confromtation by means of videotape playback as opposed to the more traditional means of self-confrontation which we might call instructor confrontation or criticism. We had three conditions-- the straight television playback in which the students' speeches were videotaped and played back at the next class period with no instructor criticism; a second condition was what one might call the traditional teaching method, the student gave his speech and immediately thereafter the instructor gave his criticism; and the third method involved videotaping the speech and then playing it back, with instructor criticism, at the end of the class period. One important factor was that we did not simply videotape a speaker; we concentrated more on videotaping the audience rather than the speaker. Our purpose in the course, we believe, is not a performance goal but a cognitive goal. We wish to have the students develop the right attitudes toward communication, to be audience-oriented, rather than speaker-oriented, and of course this implies the assumption that this might have some effect on behavior. If it doesn't, we might wonder whether what we are doing is worthwhile at all. We used a split-screen technique. During the first term, we had a screen on which half was the speaker and half was the audience. We learned, among other things, that you can't show very much of an audience on a 21-inch screen. The second term, therefore, started out with full-screen speaker and then as the talk progressed, we wiped the speaker off gradually and had audience only. This was designed to encourage the students to concentrate on the audience, and from their comments, we are encouraged to believe that it did so. Our dependent variables were a bit different than some. Some 30 judges are involved-- but not in judging student speaking performances. During the term, we asked the students to write four essays-- 2 at the beginning and 2 at the end. At the beginning and end of the term, we asked them to evaluate their own ability as oral communicators, and, at the beginning and at the end, we showed them a filmed speech and asked them to write a critique of it. We are asking the judges to evaluate these essays in terms of the degree of insight into communication processes which they exhibit. We do have other dependent variables. We have self-ratings of confidence at the beginning and end of the term, ratings on the use of television at the beginning and end of the term, ratings of the course, we have test scores, and, of course, we have grades. We have only analyzed one piece of the data, and that is on test scores. The self-confrontation alone-- without teacher criticism-- yielded significantly lower test marks than the other two conditions. We had very serious doubts in our minds whether we should continue that condition during the second term of study. During the first term we almost had a rebellion. The students who only saw themselves on television without instructor criticism disliked the course, disliked the instructor, and were generally incensed about the whole thing. We did follow the same procedure during the second term and we got the same reactions. On the basis of these subjective observations-- and quite independent of whatever the hard data may show-- I am prepared to say that this is a poor method of instruction.

-- Another project that we are getting ready for now, and for which we will be seeking funding, is a project employing desensitization therapy in the reduction of stage fright, or normal speech fright. There is quite a bit of research indicating that persons can, with proper behavior therapy, overcome quite a number of fears. Our preliminary findings indicate that there can be a very substantial reduction in speech fright following as few as 7 sessions. We had one instance where a student-- whom we described as a basket case-- came in with the highest possible fright level score on our pretest score. During this past term, that student ran for and won a dormitory presidency. Prior to the desensitization, the student was almost literally scared to death. We do not yet have all of our results on this study, but we plan to report on it in detail at the December convention.

Stanley F. Paulson, Pennsylvania State University, A Study of the Persuasiveness of a Radical Speaker Determined by Audience Reaction to a Moderate Proposal from a Subsequent Speaker.

Before describing this study, I would like to make observations about something related to the New Orleans conference. I am speaking particularly with reference to the proposal that there be an articulated program of the study of speech-communication as applied to education, going from the earliest levels to the highest levels of education. We have one project underway-- as many others do; ours is tied to a Title III program in central Pennsylvania. It is a program that has involved a large number of the speech faculty-- not only those in speech education but speech scientists, those who are involved in small group research, and those who are involved in rhetoric. One of the rhetoricians is the director of an Institute this summer of 6 weeks' duration for elementary school teachers. There are 2 Institutes going on and this is the third summer. About 175 teachers in central Pennsylvania have been involved in these institutes. This is an attempt to apply a simplified version of communication theory-- not as a speech methods area to be included in the elementary curriculum, but as a base for instruction in all areas. The program has expanded considerably over the three years to a point where it is hard for us to keep our teachers teaching their regular courses. For any of you who are particularly interested in this, Gerald Phillips is the man in charge. A manual has just been published this last week pursuant to Grant No. 673336, a copy of which any of you may obtain by writing to Gerald Phillips at Penn State.

-- With regard to the question of dissent, and another area of consideration at the New Orleans Conference-- the matter of social relevance, you will recall the study by Brooks and Scheidel in SPEECH MONOGRAPHS which revealed that a process study secured different results-- radically different results-- from the traditional experimental form of pre-test and post-test. A speech of Malcolm X was used, and there was a progressive decline in the ethos of the speaker when the semantic differential was used at regular intervals during the speech. We have done a small replication of this on the campus. One of our graduate students has found that this is not only true with respect to ethos, but that it was also true with respect to the attitude of the audience toward the proposition of the speaker. We have in progress now a study in which a speech about guaranteed annual income would be preceded for one group by a very radical attack on the majority in the country, the indifference to the poor, the need for the poor to use whatever militant means they have in order to protest-- followed, then, by a moderate speech. In the other group, there would be a preliminary speech which would be moderate in character. This study relates not just to one speech but to the process nature of communication. Presumably, if one extrapolates from the Scheidel results, one concludes that Malcolm X is a failure in that speech. The radical is a failure because there may be in his immediate audience a rejection of his proposal, perhaps a decline in acceptance of him as a person of some credibility. The question isn't whether that speech is a success, but whether it would provide an opening for a subsequent speech which may be more moderate and which may be more successful than it could otherwise have been. A moderate speech, then, will in one instance be preceded by a radical attack which presumably will be rejected, but which might very well open the possibility for a moderate proposal. Obviously, this has a number of implications-- not only for what is going on around us-- but also in terms of a reexamination of the process character which includes speeches which by their single attack on a problem are ineffective-- and ineffective in terms of many kinds of traditional theory, but which are effective because they are part of a particular campaign which utilizes different strategies of attack. If it does nothing else, we hope that it may help us to understand the next uprising on our campus.

NOTE: Kenneth Regenbaum, Lea College, was unable to be present to report on his investigation into the concerns of selected New York theatre critics.

Richard Rieke, Ohio State University, Shaw University-Ohio State University Curriculum Development in Communications.

Shaw University, a predominantly Negro institution in Raleigh, N.C., has established a consultant relationship with the Communications Area of the Department of Speech at Ohio State University toward the development of a Division of Communications. A division at Shaw is equivalent to a college, and the other colleges would be in the humanities and in the social sciences. The funding for the first year of a 5-year project is $150,000 from Title III money. The report of the first year has just been presented, and my comments will be a brief summary of some of the matters contained in that report.

-- Shaw University is an institution with almost total black enrollment. It is presently undergoing a rapid acceleration reflecting the greater availability of higher education for the Negro American. Efforts are being made to gear the Negro institution more specifically to the needs of its students. The administration at Shawhas concluded that training in communication should be a part of the institution's general acceleration. Three essential tasks face the Ohio State consultants in this project. First, is the need to gather data about the Shaw University students to learn of their special needs and to learn where their needs are typical of all college students. Second, the consultants are asked to design a communications curriculum to meet the results of the research program and to adapt to the Shaw University situation. And finally, the consultants are asked to provide guidance in the hiring of faculty and in the training of present faculty in order to implement the program.

-- The research program had 2 general facets. One was aimed at the analysis of voice, articulation, language, and some allied processes which would be useful indices as to the need for a speech clinic and correction program, and the other was aimed at a constellation of variables that we have come to associate with communication processes and activities. The various investigators spent time on the Shaw University campus during the summer and fall of 1967. A detailed data collecting program was developed, comparison groups were studied in detail, and in one case, an attempt was made to arrange matched groups of Northern Caucasian and Negro students and Southern Caucasian students. We used some samples with the Northern Caucasian students, and, when they were available, we used the national norms from standardized tests. Some of the questions that we asked follow: What is the level of aspiration-- in the sense of personal worth-- of the Shaw University student? What interest did the students have for vocations that make demands in communication? What is their level of listening skill, what is the level of auditory proficiency? What is their level of proficiency in voice intelligibility acceptability? What communication models do the Shaw students use in evaluating their own speech? What interrelationships are found among these variables?

-- Some of our findings to date are as follows: The Shaw University students show typical norms on the level of aspiration test. On a test of sense of personal worth, the Shaw students performed at the 90th percentile. On the other hand, we found that the Shaw students show a strong need for approval and conformity to socially-sanctioned ways. The basic course that is developing at Shaw involves a full year of study. We have recommended 3 such courses. The first is a non-credit remedial course intended to serve students in speech and hearing therapy and in speech improvement. The second course is entitled, "The Dynamics of Communication;" it is focused on basic principles of communication, divided into concentrations on interpersonal and group communication, public and organizational communication, and mass communication. This course involves increasing student activity, but the primary focus is on theory. The third course that has been proposed is entitled, "The Rhetoric of Change in Contemporary Society;" This involves a broad study of persuasion theory.

-- In terms of implementation of the program, four new faculty members have been hired upon recommendation of the Ohio State consultants. One is in the area of broadcasting, one is a specialist in communications theory, and two are speech and hearing therapists. Two of the current Shaw University faculty have spent a week-long seminar with Ohio State faculty in preparation for teaching the course in Dynamics of Communication. A 10 watt FM broadcasting station has been approved and will serve as a laboratory. A forensics program has been established, and the curriculum will begin in the fall of 1968. Funding for the second year of this 5-year program has been approved. We will now turn toward determining the extent to which the needs that have been revealed are being fulfilled. Additional reports will follow.

Thomas M. Steinfatt, Michigan State University, An Individual Information Processing Model.

The acronym for this study, an Individual Information Processing Model, is IIPROM. This model derives in part from a model developed by Miles Martin, formerly of Michigan State. I have made a number of changes in this model, and it now really bears very little relationship to the original model. With some help from a colleague in the department of sociology at MSU, we are seeking to turn this model into a computer simulation model, using the computer language known as IPL-V.

-- IIPROM is a model of internal receiver processes which considers the question of what happens to an individual's cognitive states, when an incoming message impinges on them from outside of the individual. More briefly, what happens to a message when it arrives at the receiver? IIPROM is a computer model, and for a very specific reason. Models are useful insofar as they allow us to synthesize research results and help us to select further areas of study. Models have been criticized for forcing a premature closure on a particular area of investigation. If a model is widely accepted before all of the evidence is in, and it never is all in, the model can become a reactionary force that tends to preserve the theoretical status quo. Computer simulation offers at least a partial antidote. Computer simulation involves programming the model in computer language--as opposed to, for example, diagramming it on a piece of paper. The computer, then, can simulate the physical or human system that is of concern. Computer simulation forces the investigator to specify with great precision each and every stage of the model. There can be no hidden or overlooked sections in the model. Once the model has been programmed, the input parameters may be varied over hundreds and even thousands of different values-- all in a very short space of time. If the output does not make sense, it will be immediately apparent where the model does and where it does not apply. Thus, the danger of over-adoption of the model is significantly reduced. Until a few years ago, these advantages of computer simulation could not be fully realized. The chief roadblock was the lack of a suitable computer language. Several have now been developed, of which one of the best known is IPL-V. IPL-V has a number of distinct advantages, one of which is in the efficiency of the IPL-V commands. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, with IPL-V, one can get away from the address register assumptions of modern computers. The lists used in IPL-V are an attempt to get away from the integer properties of storage cells. The difference between storage by position and storage by association is fundamental. In the first place, storage by association is much more flexible, and in the second place, humans appear to store information by associational processes. There is no evidence to suggest that anything like an address register exists in the human brain.

Note: At this juncture, the speaker presented a description of the IIPROM model, using a diagram which he had distributed to the audience. It is suggested that persons desiring more detailed information about the IIPROM model should contact Mr. Steinfatt. The brief description that follows, has been taken from the abstract of the study submitted before the conference.

-- IIPROM incoprorates the processes of selective exposure, selective perception, and selective retention, and the process of attitude change, together with the concepts of attention, perception, belief, value, belief system, relevance, importance, memory, credibility, and information, into a workable model of the human system for processing incoming messages. IIPROM will be programmed in IPL-V and run on a Control Data 3600 computer.

Raymond Van Dusen, Mississippi College for Women, An Oral Approach to Language Improvement.

This is a Title III program, the purpose of which is to provide compensatory instructional activity designed to improve the oral language usage of economically and culturally deprived students whose speech patterns place them at a disadvantage socially, vocationally, and educationally. It seeks to provide in-service training in improving oral language patterns of usage for school personnel and to provide good examples of oral language usage through television. The Tupelo Public Schools asked me to serve on this project in a consultant capacity. We worked for 27 weeks, two hours each week, with 14 Negro females, 6 Negro males, 23 white females, and 3 white males in a 30-station language laboratory situation. We had two classes that met for two hours each once a week. I provided previously prepared tapes for them to listen to. The approach was mainly one of bombardment on individual sounds. Dr. Harvey Cromwell and I have developed a manual for that purpose. We went through each of the speech sounds and presented words, phrases, and sentences. I would speak the sounds and words and ask them to repeat after me. They did pretty well, although I cannot make any great claims for the model that they were asked to follow. We were striving for speech that would be more clear and distinct, and so consequently great emphasis was placed on articulation and pronunciation. Our hope was that any improvement achieved would carry on down to the children in the classes. We used the General American dialect. Each student had a Kenyon and Knott Dictionary of American Pronunciation. This program extended over 27 weeks-- attendance was very good, and interest was high. We worked through the full repertory of sounds. They had particular difficulties with the consonant "r" sound and with dipthongs. At the beginning of the program, we made a tape of each class member reading standardized selections, and then we had them tape the same selections at the end of the program. These tapes were subjected to evaluation by a team of 3 speech therapists and one general speech teacher. They were asked to judge the articulation, pronunciation, voice, and general effectiveness of the speaker. The evaluators did not know whether they were evaluating the first tape or the second tape of a particular speaker. A 5-point scale was used, with 5 being superior and 1 being poor. The means of the assessment scores for each of the two classes were tested for significant difference. With one of the classes, we found a t-score of 7.87 which yielded a result that indicated that the mean of the differences is significant at something better than a 1% level of confidence. The t-score for the other class was 10.34 and it revealed that the students had improved significantly. The emphasis, as I have said, was on pronunciation and articulation, but there seemed to be a spill-over that resulted in improvement in voice. The general effectiveness score improved significantly also. At the close of the program, we distributed an evaluative questionnaire to the teachers and principals who had been enrolled in the classes. The response to the questionnaire-- along with the testing of the tape recordings-- indicated that there was value in the program for the participants.

OPEN FORUM:

RESEARCH AND INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE COMMUNICATION ARTS AND SCIENCES

Presiding: Douglas Ehninger

COMMENT: I am a bit disturbed by the seeming heavy emphasis on quantitative studies that appears to be a major thrust of the New Orleans recommendations.

COMMENT: With reference to these recommendations, it should be remembered that buried in there somewhere is a call for more descriptive and field studies.

COMMENT: The innovative impact that behavioral-experimental efforts have made in our field is so clear that one would have to be blind not to recognize it and appreciate it. We have now come to a point, apparently, where those using these methods are concerned with the status of them within the Association, and in their departments and among their colleagues. It seems to me almost madness to be discussing the kinds of problems to which we ought to be addressing ourselves. There are enough problems to go around, and in almost any circumstance free men are likely to address themselves to the kind of problems they get interested in-- and good will come of it. Similarly, it seems to me almost as mad to try to be excessively dogmatic about what the methods should be in attacking a problem, once it has been identified. Quite obviously, one will use the best means available. Better mousetraps are always welcome!

COMMENT: I have been soewhat disturbed by the implication that there is something new in quantitative studies. A number of years ago, I did a quantitative study as my dissertation, and over the years I have guided a number of such studies. To be sure, I did not have a computer at my disposal, but we did have some elaborate calculators which we though then were turning out some innovative results. It is not something new. If we persist in looking at it as something new, we are in danger of giving it undue emphasis in relation to the whole. I view the quantitative method as but one of many valuable approaches to research.

EHNINGER: Perhaps it should be emphasized that the recommendations of the New Orleans conference were in no sense a statement on the part of the Association. That is made very clear in the document. The conferees were speaking as a group of individuals, who happened to be members of the Association, and who had interests in the same general kinds of problems and research areas. It is our hope that the conference on rhetoric, about which you heard yesterday, will produce a set of recommendations that people in other areas will concur on and develop. --- Considerable interest was expressed on the questionnaire sent to you on the role that the SAA might play in relation to problems of dissent and disorder-- problems of tension, alienation among different groups and classes-- insofar as they are communication-related. The officers of the Association have been spending a great deal of time and thought on these questions, and I would like to have expressions of opinion on our possible role. There are various points of view relative to the study of these matters and relative to possible service functions that we might perform.

BOWERS: In the coursework that I am doing, we have what might be called a task force-- two men from psychology, and a man from sociology-- who share with me a class in conflict resolution. We changed the designation to Conflict Management because we decided that we can't resolve conflict. I think that I am learning more than the students. The impact on the campus is beginning to be felt. There are small groups organizing in the underground to effect campus behavior. One of the results of this was that the recent student body president was a founder of the underground. There are now forces operating to hold back the breaking loose of violent disorder on the campus. This resulted from a very carefully planned strategy on the part of the task force to get to the student body and to try to forestall disorder. It is an action program that has been designed as a part of the course program.

HOWELL: I think that we can do a better job of collecting data in the field. I am reminded of Paul Cashman, a member of this Association, who is now Vice-President for Student Affairs at the University of Minnesota. He is very much in touch with these student problems. As a matter of fact, he is about to spend a month in

Paris at the Sorbonne mingling with the students who have been rioting there. He is going to collect whatever information he can about the causes of student unrest. This strikes me as a very direct approach-- one that merits consideration.

COMMENT: Although I am not directly involved, I can report something of a program that is being carried out at Southern Illinois University. We have two graduate students who spent the last year here in Chicago in the ghetto areas. One of them contacted the leaders of the revolutionary movement, and the other one contacted the leader from the extreme right. This summer we are having a seminar on urban tension. We have brought these leaders down, one at a time. This is in progress right now. Video tapes are being made, and a dissertation will result. We also hope that there will be further seminars. We do not know just where we stand on this right now, but it has been a tremendously educational and broadening experience. Dennis Winters and Russ Jennings are the two graduate students; Thomas Pace is in charge of the seminar.

COMMENT: One of the things that I will be involved in in a new position that I have accepted will be in responding to a request from persons outside of the speech department for a course-- as a part of the general education program at Indiana State University--which would in some way address itself to the problems of dissent and disorder. It would not be a performance course. An underlying idea of the course would be to develop an understanding of the importance of free expression as well as effective expression by demonstrating from a historical standpoint the power of free and effective expression. This is all very tentative, but it is particularly interesting to me that the stimulus for this course came from outside of the department and that there is a feeling that our department has something to contribute in enunciating, from a historical perspective, the values of free and effective expression.

ARNOLD:From what we have just heard, it is apparent that a great deal of data is being collected. One of my graduate students has been walking up and down the hot streets of New York with Mayor Lindsay and with notebook and tape recorder in hand; he will have data to contribute. My observation is simply that it appears that a good bit of relevant data is being gathered, and I am wondering where we go from here.

EHNINGER: One possibility is that the Association might assume clearinghouse responsibilities for this kind of information so that all of us will better know just what is going on.

QUESTION: Is there a possibility that we might bring in at the convention in December a group of student activists to engage in exchanges with some of our people?

EHNINGER: I do not know whether such a session has been planned. I can report that the Association is attempting to structure a small conference to explore these matters this summer. (Note: The small conference alluded to was subsequently scheduled for Chicago, August 8-9, 1968.) --- The directors of graduate programs in speech pathology recently met for a week on our campus in Iowa City. One of the matters with which they are greatly concerned is post-doctoral research training. Individuals who received their doctoral degrees some twenty years ago now frequently, to cite one example, claim that they do not even understand the newer instrumentation in some of the more advanced laboratories. I should also observe that I sensed a generation gap at New Orleans. I sensed a feeling among the young participants that the persons who received their doctorates a number of years ago were pretty much out of date, that they need some form of retraining akin, perhaps, to that which is provided for medical doctors. Is this a problem area for us?

COMMENT: I recently finished my doctorate at the University of Illinois in the behavioral sciences. I feel that I already need post-doctoral training. It seems to me that, in face of the present knowledge explosion, virtually all of us need some form of continuing post-doctoral training.

EHNINGER: Does anyone know of any existing programs in this area? .... Apparently not. I will go on record with the lady who has just spoken to the effect that post-doctoral training might be a very good thing for many of us. --- Another of the possible discussion topics listed was in the area of the language problems of the disadvantaged. This has certainly already been touched upon in our deliberations, and I suspect that most of you are aware of the SAA Speech Proficiency Commission, a body that has been concerned with this problem for some time.

ARNOLD: Since you are not getting a response on this, may I return to the matter that we have just been discussing. I have just had a whispered conference with Jim Roever, and I think that it would be helpful to the Research Board and to Jim, if I were to report to you a matter that we were discussing the other evening, and then seek your reactions to it. We were discussing ways and means for increasing the impact of the New Orleans conference. We considered the possibility of regional conferences to discuss the recommendations and their implications. We were thinking primarily in terms of broader dissemination. In the light of what has just been said here, however, it seems to me that it might be appropriate, as we think about further dissemination activities, to also think about the problems of retraining. Is it the wisdom of this group that these two dimensions might be reasonably conjoined?

HOWELL: I may be on a different track here. It occurs to me on this "retreading" matter, that many times our interests might lie outside speech departments. We ought, for example, to be free to go into psychology for a year, into anthropology for a year, or into some other area-- wherever we can find what we need. Perhaps this phenomenon can be applied in reverse. If we can get our interest in communication across to the academic community, if we can suggest that we would be receptive to dialogue with others interested in communication, I think we might attract some "customers" from other fields with some very good results. As a specific example of this, I would mention a child psychiatrist who has become interested in our work in speech-communication, and he is taking a year off for study with us. He is having a great time and is apparently picking up some interesting and useful new perspectives. It would be a good thing, I think, if we could get people moving more freely back and forth across departmental lines.

BRYANT: The notion of regional conferences seems to me to be a useful one. Useful purposes might also be served by local conferences on the campus. With specific reference to our summer conferences, it has occurred to me that we might profitably extend the feature that was introduced last year of breaking down into small groups that have a particular interest in matters of quite narrow focus. These sessions might include reports on the progress in research in that area.

BYSTROM: In this matter of extending professional growth, it seems to me that there is considerable room for Association activity. The Association is in a position to help individuals to overcome barriers within institutions that limit experience. In major corporations and in the government there is presently a calculated effort to get government people into industrial positions in areas of common interest. There are a variety of intern programs, one-year consultant arrangements which would permit someone from a speech department to move into a situation where there would be opportunity for actually practicing some of the activities with which he has been concerned on the campus. There are tens of thousands of such arrangements today, and they have grown out of a need for expanding the experiences of managers in all kinds of enterprises. I see a real opportunity to find out more about these opportunities and to make a real effort to place properly qualified speech people in these kinds of appointments. It seems to me that there is widespread misunderstanding among speech people of, to cite one example, the role of debate in the Senate and in the House. Many speech people seem to think that persuasion is the goal. Speech people sometimes draw erroneous conclusions about the implications of the presence or absence of a congressman at a particular debate. A year spent in the congressional arena would disabuse these persons of such beliefs. They could, so to speak, bring this direct experience back into the profession and thereby upgrade the profession. One could cite a parallel example in the realm of ghost-writing. There are some strange notions abroad about the ways in which the speeches of public figures are put together. Short of direct involvement, it is very difficult to determine, for example, the complex factors that enter into decisions about what to include and what not to include in a speech. I suggest this internship type of activity, then, as a potentially valuable means of post-graduate education. It is my judgment that there are ample funds both in government and in industry for the support of these programs. --- I also want to make a comment about the earlier discussion on empirical and non-empirical studies. It seems to me that there is a wide range of studies that can legitimately draw upon both kinds of approaches. There are certain limitations on the use of empirical data, simply because the persons who are being studied will not submit to the behavioral "hocus-pocus" that is required to collect the behavioral data. Behavioral data, furthermore, are not going to be very helpful in assessing the effects of precedent, previous experience, and such matters. This kind of information must come from the library. It seems to me that efforts to determine the communication processes of institutions must perforce draw upon a wide range of methodologies. I suggest this as a research area that would provide a very fruitful meeting-ground for scholars of different persuasions.

EHNINGER: In these clsoing moments, I would like to mention a feature of the December convention program that I do not believe Dr. Nichols mentioned. It is a feature that bears a relationship to the generation gap problem that we were talking about earlier. A session will be held under the title, "The Young Turks Meet the Establishment." The officers of the Association will be available in what we hope will be fairly relaxed surroundings to listen to persons who have something on their minds. The only requirement for admission to this session is that you be under thirty-five years of age. We want to hear from people in that age bracket in the hope that, from an Association standpoint, it may help us to bridge our generation gap. We hope that something will really come of this, and we encourage you to participate-- or to urge your younger colleagues to do so. --- As we adjourn, I note that the three members of the Research Board and Jim Roever are still present, and I hope that, if you have ideas about the conduct of this conference next year, you will express those ideas. Perhaps we should ask how many of you here feel that there should be a next summer conference? (Near-unanimous positive support was indicated.) --- We thank you for being with us. We are adjourned.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Editor's note: The bibliography that follows consists mainly of items that were on display at the July, 1968 Chicago conference. A few additional items have been noted. Some of the titles may not still be available. A key to the sources, including mailing addresses, appears at the end.

In the entries below, the following information, when available, has been given: title, author, or editor, source, publication number, year, price. Where a price is not given, it usually means that the publication is free.

A GUIDE TO ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES. Prepared by the New England Educational Assessment Project. 1966.

AMERICAN EDUCATION. USOE. GPO. May 1968. Yearly subscription, $3.75; single copy, 45¢.

ARTS AND HUMANITIES EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH PROJECTS. USOE. 1967.

THE ARTS OF LANGUAGE. Report of University of Nebraska USOE Conference, 1966. Paul A. Olson, Ed. Nebraska Curriculum Development Center. MLA, 50¢ + P & H.

CATALOG: CAPTIONED FILMS FOR THE DEAF. Prepared by Anita A. Carpenter. USOE. GPO. OE-34035-B. 1967.

CATALOG: FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS. Office of Economic Opportunity. 1967.

COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS AND RESOURCES IN THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES. National Academy of Sciences. 1967.

COMPUTERS ON CAMPUS. Caffrey Mosmann. American Council on Education. 1967. $3.00.

CURRICULUM PATTERNS IN ENGLISH. Donald R. Tuttle. USOE. GPO. OE-33027. 1965. 30¢.

DIGEST OF EDUCATIONAL STATISTICS. USOE. GPO. OE-10024-66. 1966. $1.00.

ERIC CATALOG OF SELECTED DOCUMENTS ON THE DISADVANTAGED: NUMBER AND AUTHOR INDEX. USOE. GPO. OE-37001. 1966. 65¢.

ERIC CATALOG OF SELECTED DOCUMENTS ON THE DISADVANTAGED: SUBJECT INDEX. USOE. GPO. OE-37002. 1966. $3.

FACT BOOK: OFFICE OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS. USOE. GPO. OE-11011. 1967. 50¢.

FEDERAL FUNDS AND SERVICES FOR THE ARTS. USOE. GPO. OE-50050. $1.00.

FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS BENEFITING THE DISADVANTAGED AND HANDICAPPED. USOE. GPO. OE-35092. 1968.

FEDERAL RESEARCH PROGRAMS IN FIELDS OF THE DISADVANTAGED AND HANDICAPPED. USOE. 1967.

THE FOUNDATION DIRECTORY. (3rd edition.) Marianna O. Lewis, Ed. Russell Sage Foundation. 1967. $12.00.

GUIDELINES: FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING INSTRUCTION IN THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS. USOE. GPO. OE-33039. 1966.

94

GRANT DATA QUARTERLY. Vol. II, No. 2, 1968. Academic Media, Inc. Single subscription, $35; two or more, 10% discount.
HIGHER EDUCATION & NATIONAL AFFAIRS. Bulletin published by the ACE 40 times a year. Distributed free in specified quantities through the heads of organizations and institutions holding membership in the Council. Individual subscriptions $12 per year.
HIGHER EDUCATION AND PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL SERVICE. Elizabeth N. Shiver, Ed. ACE. 1967.
HOW TO PREPARE A RESEARCH PROPOSAL. David R. Krathwohl. Available through SAA. Single copies, $1.00.
IMPROVING ENGLISH SKILLS OF CULTURALLY DIFFERENT YOUTH. USOE. GPO. OE-30012. 1964. 75¢.
IMPROVING LANGUAGE ARTS INSTRUCTION THROUGH RESEARCH. Harold G. Shane and Jane Grant Mulry. NEA. 1963.
IIE SERVICES TO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES. Institute of International Education. 1963.
INSTITUTE PROGRAMS FOR ADVANCED STUDY. 1968-69. USOE. GPO. OE-55042-69.
INSTRUCTIONS FOR TITLE I APPLICATION FORMS. USOE. OE-37003. 1966.
INTERDISCIPLINARY MEETING ON THE LANGUAGE PROBLEMS OF THE DISADVANTAGED. January 1968. William Work, Ed. Available through SAA. $1.50.
IRCD Bulletin. Request free subscrptns. from: Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged. See sources at end.
JOURNAL OF LEARNING DISABILITIES. Vol. 1, No. 6, June 1968. One-year subscription, $7.00; two years, $10.
LANGUAGE ABILITY GRADES SEVEN, EIGHT, AND NINE. Walter Loban. USOE. GPO. OE-30018. 1966.
LANGUAGE LABORATORY FACILITIES. Alfred S. Hayes. USOE. GPO. 1964. OE-21024. 50¢.
LANGUAGE RESEARCH IN PROGRESS: 6. Center for Applied Linguistics. 1968.
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS. NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS. Annual Report, 1967. GPO. 30¢.
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES. 2nd Annual Report, 1967. GPO. 25¢.
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES: PROGRAM INFORMATION. 1968. GPO. 1967.
NASSP BULLETIN: RADIO AND TELEVISION IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL. NASSP Oct., 1966. $15 yearly; single copies, $2 each. Available through SAA.
NATIONAL DEFENSE GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS GRADUATE PROGRAMS 1968-69. USOE. GPO. OE-55017-69.
NATIONAL NDEA INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN TEACHING DISADVANTAGED YOUTH. No. 1 in a series. February, 1967. Secure copy by writing to 1126 16th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.
NDEA NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN TEACHING DISADVANTAGED YOUTH. Bulletin 3, March 1968.
OFFICE OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS FACT BOOK. USOE, GPO. 1967. 50¢.

PACE-- A MANUAL FOR PROJECT APPLICANTS. USOE. GPO.
PACE-- PACESETTERS IN INNOVATION. USOE. GPO. OE-20101. May, 1967.
PACE-- A MANUAL FOR PROJECT APPLICANTS AND GRANTEES. USOE. GPO. May, 1967. (Revised.)
PATHWAY TO IMPROVED COMMUNICATIONS. Illinois Journal of Education. Ray Page, Ed. Illinois Superintendent of Public Instruction. 1967.
PREPARATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL...NEW DIRECTIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES, CEC, NEA. Frederick J. Weintraub, Ed. 1968.
PROGRAM EVALUATION AND REVIEW TECHNIQUE: APPLICATIONS IN EDUCATION. Desmond L. Cook. USOE. GPO. OE-12024. 1966. 45¢.
PROJECTIONS OF EDUCATIONAL STATISTICS TO 1975-76. Kenneth A. Simon and Marie G. Fullam, Eds. USOE. GPO. OE-10030. 1966. $1.00.
1967 REPORT ON FEDERAL MONEY AND RECENT LEGISLATION FOR EDUCATION. American Education. GPO. 15¢.
REASON AND CHANGE IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION. USOE. 1968.
REGIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAM (SMALL PROJECT RESEARCH). 1967. USOE. GPO.
REPORT ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES INSTITUTES OF 1966, CONPASS. Donald J. Gray. 1966.
REPORT ON THE EXPERIENCED TEACHER FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM, 1966-67. Walter H. Crockett, Joseph C. Bentley, James D. Laird. Consortium of Professional Associations for the Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs.
RESEARCH IN EDUCATION. USOE. GPO. 1968. $11.00 per year.
RESEARCH IN INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION AND FILM. Summaries of Studies by J. C. Reid and Donald W. MacLennan. USOE. GPO. OE-34041. $1.25.
SOURCES OF AUDIOVISUAL MATERIALS. Milbrey L. Jones. USOE. GPO. OE-35090. 1967. 15¢.
SPECIAL REPORT ON FEDERAL PROGRAMS. ACE. Prepared by the Commission on Federal Relations and issued from time to time to report to Council members on Federal legislative or administrative developments affecting higher education. Specified quantities sent free to heads of institutions and organizations holding membership in the Council.
TEACHER CORPS GUIDELINES. USOE, 1968. Tri-University Project in Elementary Education.
TEACHER'S GUIDE TO HIGH SCHOOL SPEECH. Indiana State Department of Public Instruction. 1966. Available through SAA. $1.75.
TEACHING SPEAKING AND WRITING IN WISCONSIN. Department of Public Instruction, Madison, Wisconsin, 1966.
TITLE I, YEAR II. Second Annual Report of Title I of ESEA, school year 1966-67. USOE. GPO. OE-37013.
UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM PATTERNS: A SURVEY OF BACCALAUREATE PROGRAMS IN SELECTED FIELDS, 1962-63. Harold A. Haswell and Clarence B. Lindquist, Eds. USOE. GPO. OE-56021. 1965. 35¢.
USOE SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES. USOE. GPO. OE-12025. 1967.
USOE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH. USOE. GPO. OE-12026. 1967.

Key to Sources

ACE, American Council on Education, 1785 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.
CAL, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.
GPO, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.
IIE, Institute of International Education, 809 U. N. Plaza, New York, N. Y.
IRCD, Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged, Ferkauf Graduate School of Education, Yeshiva University, 55 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 10003.
MLA, Modern Language Association, 60 Fifth Avenue, N. Y., N. Y. 1001
NAS, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C.
NCTE, National Council of Teachers of English, 508 S. Sixth St., Champaign, Illinois 61820.
NEA, National Education Association, 1201 16th St., N.W., Washington D.C. 20036.
NFAH, National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, 1800 G. St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20506. (National Endowment for the Arts and National Endowment for the Humanities are both at the above address.)
OEO, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.
SAA, Speech Association of America, Statler Hilton Hotel, New York, N. Y. 10001.
USOE, U. S. Office of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

USOE REGIONAL OFFICES

Regional Office of Education staff are located at the following addresses:

Region	States Served	Address
Region I	Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont	Office of Education John F. Kennedy Bldg. Boston, Mass. 02203
Region II	Delaware, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania	Office of Education 26 Federal Plaza New York, N. Y. 10007
Region III	Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, Virginia, Virgin Islands, West Virginia, District of Columbia	Office of Education 220 Seventh St., NE Charlottesville, Va. 22901
Region IV	Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee	Office of Education 50 Seventh St., NE, Rm. 404 Atlanta, Ga. 30323
Region V	Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin	Office of Education 226 W. Jackson Boulevard Chicago, Ill. 60606
Region VI	Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota	Office of Education 601 E. 12th St. Kansas City, Mo. 64106
Region VII	Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas	Office of Education 1114 Commerce St. Dallas, Tex. 75202
Region VIII	Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Utah, Wyoming	Office of Education Federal Office Bldg.,Rm.9017 19th & Stout Streets Denver, Colo. 80202
Region IX	Alaska, Arizona, California, Guam, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, American Samoa	Office of Education 50 Fulton Street, Rm. 232 San Francisco, Cal. 94102

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSES

The Educational Research Information Center (ERIC) is a nationwide network comprising a Central Staff at the U.S. Office of Education and decentralized information centers, or clearinghouses, that are focused upon specific substantive areas of education. The centers select and acquire significant research and research-related materials so they can inform others about the developments in their respective areas.

ADULT EDUCATION
Syracuse University
107 Roney Lane
Syracuse, N.Y. 13210

COUNSELING AND PERSONNEL SERVICES
611 Church St.
Ann Arbor, Mich. 48114

DISADVANTAGED
Yeshiva University
55 Fifth Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10003

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
University of Illinois
805 W. Pennsylvania Ave.
Urbana, Ill. 61801

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
University of Oregon
Eugene, Ore. 97403

EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES
University of Wisconsin
606 State St.
Madison, Wisc. 53706

EDUCATIONAL MEDIA & TECHNOLOGY
Institute for Communication Research
Stanford University
Stanford, Cal. 94305

EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN
National Education Association
1201 16th St.NW
Washington, D.C. 20036

HIGHER EDUCATION
(to be designated)

JUNIOR COLLEGES
University of California at L.A.
405 Hilgard Ave.
Los Angeles, Cal. 90024

LIBRARY & INFORMATION SCIENCES
University of Minnesota
2122 Riverside Ave.
Minneapolis, Minn. 55404

LINGUISTICS
Center for Applied Linguistics
1717 Massachusetts Ave.NW
Washington, D.C. 20036

READING
Indiana University
204 Pine Hall
Bloomington, Ind. 47401

RURAL EDUCATION & SMALL SCHOOLS
Box AP, University Park Branch
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, N.M. 88001

SCIENCE EDUCATION
Ohio State University
1460 West Lane Ave.
Columbus, Ohio 43221

TEACHER EDUCATION
(to be designated)

TEACHING OF ENGLISH
National Council of Teachers of English
508 South Sixth St.
Champaign, Ill. 61820

TEACHING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES
Modern Language Association of America
62 Fifth Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10011

VOCATIONAL & TECHNICAL EDUCATION
Ohio State University
980 Kinnear Road
Columbus, Ohio 43212